PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

H. R. 3600. A bill to authorize the use of the funds of any tribe of Indians for in-surance premiums; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3601. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Nevada for addition to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H.R. 3602. A bill to amend the Service-men's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3603. A bill to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other pur-poses; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATTERSON: H. R. 3604. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Indians of California who were not parties to certain 18 unratified treaties; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3605. A bill to provide for a roll of the Indians of California and for the pro rata distribution of funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said Indians, and their disbursement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3606. A bill to provide procedure for

the Indians of California to engage an attorney or attorneys to represent them, take such collective action as they deem proper, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 3607. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Gen. Omar N. Bradley to the office of Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, without affecting his military status and perquisites; to the Committee on Military Af-

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. J. Res. 224. Joint resolution to provide that certain officers and employees in or under the executive branch of the Government shall be employed for no more than 44 hours week; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializ-ing the President and the Congress of the United States to support House bill 2867 and Senate bill 868, authorizing annual payments to States, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate the activities of the Federal Social Security Board with particular reference to the merit-system requirements; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York: H. R. 3608. A bill for the relief of E. Water-man & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 3609. A bill to include as Spanish-American War service under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration certain service rendered by Stephen Swan Ogletree during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H.R. 3610. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising from activities of the War Department or of the Army; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1012. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of James A. Morris and 311 other citizens of Missouri, protesting against the passage of any pro-hibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary. 1013. Also, petition of Charles R. Mason

and 314 other citizens of Missouri, protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1014. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Lycoming

County Pomona Grange of Pennsylvania, No. 28, urging that the production of alcoholic beverages be discontinued; to the Commit-

tee on the Judiciary.

1015. By Mr. WELCH: California Senate Joint Resolution 28, relative to memorializing Congress to enact House bill 2536, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, relating to the recognition of transportation companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1016. Also, California State Senate Joint Resolution 21, relative to memorializing Congress to support House bill 2867 and Senate bill 868, authorizing annual payments to States, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1017. Also, Senate Joint Resolution 22, California Legislature, relative to amendment of the Federal Social Security Act in respect to old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1018. Also, California Senate Joint Resolution 27, relative to current movements for a lenient peace with Japan, and memorializing the President and Congress to insist upon complete and unconditional surrender; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1019. Also, California Senate Joint Resolution 32, relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate through its appropriate committee the proposed construction by the War Department, that activities in connection with the said proposal be discontinued pending such investigation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1020. Also, California Assembly Joint Resolution 45, relative to memorializing the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress to retain full control over Japaneseowned or mandated islands in the Pacific which heretofore have been, or hereafter may be, captured by the United States in the course of the war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1021. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Adjutant, Twenty-ninth Division Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging General of the Army George C. Marshall to retain his present position as Chief of Staff of the United States Army at least until the termination of the war against Japan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, June 25, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following

Almighty and everlasting God, our Heavenly Father, at the white altar of peace where all divisive boundaries are forgotten, we bow in reverence and humility, praying for the enthronement of brotherhood in all the earth. May the institutions of justice, mutual understanding, and cooperative endeavor devised in these anxious yet hopeful days be but the instrument of Thy providence bringing to fulfillment at last the prophet's dream: "Violence shall be no more heard in thy lands, wasting nor destruction within thy borders."

Through the lips that speak in this forum of freedom may there be heard by a listening world the solemn summons to men of good will, of all colors and all nations, to a new commonwealth of all peoples in which power shall be administered as a sacred trust dedicated to the common good. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, June 27, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE-ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 378. An act authorizing an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the act of May 3, 1928 (45 Stat. 484), and for other purposes:

H. R. 688. An act to amend the joint resolution of January 27, 1942, entitled "Joint resolution to enable the United States to become an adhering member of the Inter-American Statistical Institute";

H. R. 802. An act for the relief of Camp No. 1, Alaska Native Brotherhood, Sitka, Alaska; H. R. 892. An act for the relief of Madeline J. MacDonald;

H.R. 912. An act for the relief of William H. Shultz:

H. R. 993. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen C. Burnett;

H. R. 1038. An act for the relief of Daniel

H. R. 1044. An act for the relief of Marlin-Rockwell Corp. with respect to the jurisdiction of The Tax Court of the United States to redetermine its excessive profits for its fiscal year ending December 31, 1942, subject to renegotiation under the Renegotiation Act:

H.R. 1055. An act for the relief of the Realty Bond & Mortgage Co. and Robert W. Keith:

H. R. 1058. An act for the relief of W. A. Smoot, Inc.;

H. R. 1059. An act for the relief of Leonard D. Jackson and Elsie Fowkes Jackson

H. R. 1091. An act for the relief of Harold J. Grim:

H.R. 1243. An act for the relief of Mrs.

C. J. Rhea, Sr.; H. R. 1320. An act for the relief of M. Elizabeth Quay;

H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia M. Tonner;

H. R. 1453. An act for the relief of Edith M. Powell:

H.R. 1482. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Samuel Wadford;

H. R. 1488. An act for the relief of Austin

Bruce Bowen;
H. R. 1599. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Norfolk-Portsmouth Bridge, Inc.;

H. R. 1611. An act for the relief of Charles E. Surmont;

H. R. 1617. An act for the relief of Hugh M. Gregory;

H. R. 1677. An act for the relief of Hires Turner Glass Co.;

H. R. 1678. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ada Wert Illinico;

H. R. 1756. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Demetrio Caquias;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of the White Van Line, Inc., of South Bend, Ind.;

H. R. 1812. An act to authorize an award of merit for uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System;

H. R. 1891. An act for the relief of the Grandview Hospital;

H. R. 2001. An act for the relief of Betty Ellen Edwards;

H. R. 2002. An act for the relief of Joseph Wyzynski;

H. R. 2003. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Stewart Martin, Jr., a minor; H. R. 2113. An act to amend the Federal

Farm Loan Act, the Emergency Farm Mort-gage Act of 1933, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, the Servicemen's Readjust-ment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2125. An act to amend the Canal Zone

H. R. 2158. An act for the relief of the Cowden Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 2286. An act for the relief of Jane Thayer:

H. R. 2322. An act to provide for the issuance of the Mexican Border Service Medal to certain members of the Reserve forces of the Army on active duty in 1916 and 1917;

H. R. 2552. An act to amend paragraph (c) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended by act approved February 27, 1931;

H. R. 2700. An act for the relief of Alice Walker;

H. R. 2721. An act for the relief of the Tobey Hospital;

H. R. 2727. An act for the relief of the estate of Herschel Adams, deceased, and Pleas Baker;

H. R. 2730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jane Strang:

H. R. 2754. An act to validate titles to certain lands conveyed by Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes and to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933, and to validate State court judgments in Oklahoma and judgments of the United States District Courts of the State of Oklahoma; H. R. 2839. An act to increase the salary of

the executive secretary of the Nurses' Examining Board of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2875. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and

members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Nelson P. Park:

H. R. 2944. An act to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities;

H. R. 2949. An act to extend 5-year-levelpremium-term policies for an additional 3

H. R. 3059. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to continue to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably;

H. R. 3074. An act for the relief of the heirs of Henry B. Tucker, deceased;

H. R. 3193. An act to permit waiving of the bonds of Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3232. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940, as amended, for the purpose of continuing it in effect;

H. R. 3233. An act to permit members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy certain Government housing facilities on a rental basis without loss of rental allow-

* H.R. 3234. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, as amended, for the purposes of continuing it in effect;

H. R. 3306. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3395. An act to extend through December 31, 1945, the termination date under the Renegotiation Act; and

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment, management, and perpetuation of the Kermit Roosevelt fund.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of Price Administration, fiscal year 1946, in the amount of \$6,430,000, in the form of an amendment to an amendment to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the number of men in active training and service in the land forces on April 30, 1945, under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

FREE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN SUBSTANCES BY BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF UNITED STATES PHAR-MACOPOEIAL CONVENTION AND COUNCIL OF AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide the free importation of certain substances by the board of trustees of the United States Pharmacopoeial Convention and the Council of the American Pharmaceutical As-

sociation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as follows:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore: A telegram in the nature of a petition from the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, New York City, N. Y., praying for the prompt ratification by the Senate of the United Nations Charter as drafted at the recent San Francisco Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Relations. By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Baltimore (Md.) Association of Credit Men, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for financial control of Government corpora-tions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Bethesda (Md.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enact ment of legislation to combine the War and Navy Departments into a Department of National Defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 401. A bill for the relief of sundry fruit growers of the State of Delaware who sustained losses as the result of the fumigation of apples with methyl bromide in order to comply with the requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to the Japanese beetle quarantine; with an amendment (Rept. No. 424); and

H. R. 259. A bill for the relief of Leo Gottlieb; with an amendment (Rept. No. 425).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1007. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice Brown Waggoner; without amendment (Rept. No. 426);

H.R. 1008. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harriette E. Harris; without amendment (Rept. No. 427); and

H. R. 1917. A bill for the relief of John R. Jennings; without amendment (Rept. No.

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 694. A bill for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers; with amendments (Rept. No. 429); S. 729. A bill for the relief of William Andrews Evans; with amendments (Rent. No. 430):

S. 762. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Everett McLendon, Sr., Everett McLendon, and Nadine McLendon; with amendments (Rept. No. 431);

S. 787. A bill for the relief of Oliver Jensen; without amendment (Rept. No. 434);

S. 909. A bill for the relief of Hugh Egan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 437);

S. 994. A bill for the relief of the Central Leaf Tobacco Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 432);

S. 1007. A bill for the relief of Edward P. Standley; with amendments (Rept. No. 433);

H. R. 852. A bill for the relief of Betty Jane Ritter; without amendment (Rept. No. 435); and

H. R. 1601. A bill for the relief of Dorothy M. Moon; without amendment (Rept. No. 436).

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Claims:

H.R. 2060. A bill for the relief of D. W. Key; without amendment (Rept. No. 438); and

H.R. 2515. A bill for the relief of Harland Bartholomew and Associates; without amendment (Rept. No. 439).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs

S. 559. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service," approved October 27, 1943, so as to make the provisions thereof effective with respect to losses occurring on or after Octo-31, 1941; with an amendment (Rept. No. 440); and

S. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the production of petroleum for the national defense from Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1; without amendment (Rept. No. 441).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S.1139. A bill for the relief of the residents of Guam through the settlement of meritorious claims; with an amendment (Rept. No. 442).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the

District of Columbia:

H.R. 2856. A bill to provide for better enforcement of law within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 443);

H. R. 3201. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended; without amendment

(Rept. No. 444);

H. R. 3257. A bill to remove restrictions to the appointment of retired officers of the United States Public Health Service or retired civilian employees of the United States Government or District of Columbia government as Superintendent of Gallinger Municipal Hospital in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 445); and without amendment

H.R. 3291. A bill to provide for an ad-justment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 446).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FED-ERAL EXPENDITURES-CIVILIAN EM-PLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of March 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none,

and it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. The total number of paid employees for March 1945, is 3,014,019, excluding 429,173 employees of the War Department stationed outside the continental United States as of December 31, 1944. The grand total of employees within and outside the continental United States is 3,443,192, for the month of March this year.

The grand total of employees stationed outside continental United States on March 31, 1945, is 548,542. Of this figure, 429,173 are employees of the War Department and the remaining 119,369 employees are employed by other depart-

ments and agencies.

During the month of March 1945, 32 departments and agencies decreased the number of their employees by 35,682, while 29 departments and agencies increased the number of their employees by 7,216, making a net decrease of 28,466 for this month.

The main reason for the net reduction for March is due to the exclusion of 13,141 employees of a terminal leave status. Due to the enactment of Public Law 525, Seventy-eighth Congress, these terminal-leave employees were excluded from the March total. The War and Navy Departments are largely responsible for this reduction, having 12,568 employees in the terminal-leave category.

The following departments and agencies reflect the respective reductions: War Department, 22,437; Navy Department, 10,938; Tennessee Valley Authority, 476; National Housing Agency, 412; and Selective Service System, 300.

The departments and agencies which increased in the month of March are as follows: Veterans' Administration, 1,260; Agriculture Department, 1,154; Post Office Department, 997; Commerce Department, 800; Office of Price Administration, 571; and Interior Department,

The committee desires to commend those departments and agencies which have made bona fide reductions during the month of March, and expresses the hope that in the near future other bureaus of the Federal Government will from time to time curtail their functions as they become nonessential, so that a maximum reduction of unnecessary Federal employees may be brought about in the interest of economy in Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report submitted by Mr. Byrn was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDUCTION IN NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, by departments and agencies, for the month of May 1945, showing the increases and decreases in number of paid employees

Department or agency	April 1945	May 1945	Increase or decrease
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
Bureau of the Budget	581	578	-3
DEPARTMENTS.	nier in	SOLP IN	SE IN
Agriculture Department Commerce Department Interior Department Justice Department Labor Department Navy Department Navy Department State Department Treasury Department War Department War Department National War Agencies	80, 411 29, 267 42, 259 27, 004 6, 135 753, 775 379, 007 10, 291 96, 037 1, 164, 641	81, 817 33, 731 43, 401 26, 643 6, 612 748, 297 377, 596 11, 640 91, 211 1, 150, 778	+1,349 -4,826
	a crionesi		THE REAL PROPERTY.
Committee on Fair Employment Practice Foreign Economic Admin-	140	136	-4
istration	6, 457	6, 366	-91
National War Labor Board.	3, 703	3, 795	
Office of Alien Property		F - 100	A
Custodian	773	769	
Office of Censorship Office of Civilian Defense	8, 981 102	8,320	-661 -25
Office of Contract Settle-	102	11	-20
ment	66	70	+4
Office of Defense Transpor-	n 400	0.004	1
tation	3, 462	3, 394	-68

Includes several thousands employees who work only
 few hours daily.
 Does not include 429,173 employees stationed outside continental United States.

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, etc.-Con.

Department or agency	April 1945	1045	Increase or decreaes
NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES-		7.00	
continued		E TOTAL	
Office of Economic Stabilization	13	15	+2
Office of Inter-American Affairs	1, 262	1, 213	-49
Office of Price Administra-	63, 381	64, 056	+675
Office of Scientific Re- search and Develop-			
ment Office of Strategic Services.	1, 326 2, 925	1, 308 2, 590	-18 -335
Office of War Information Office of War Mobilization Petroleum Administration	9, 679 188	10, 021 207	+342 +19
for War_ Selective Service System_ Smaller War Plants Cor-	1, 008 18, 980	989 18, 916	-19 -64
poration	1,874	1,857	-17
War Manpower Commis- sion	28, 393 12, 667	28,709	+316
War Production Board War Shipping Adminis-	12, 667	12, 607	-60
tration	5, 383	5, 371	-12
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES		75.073	
American Battle Monu- ments Commission	1	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board Civil Service Commission. Employees' Compensation	336 7, 696	336 7, 758	+62
Commission	507	500	-7
Export-Import Bank of Washington Federal Communications	58	59	+1
Federal Communications Commission	1, 539	1, 531	-8
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1, 438	1, 414	-24
Federal Power Commis- sion.	648	642	
Federal Security Agency Federal Trade Commis-	31, 850	32, 322	+479
Federal Works Agency	20, 485	20, 359	+1 -126
General Accounting Office Government Printing Of- fice	13, 143 6, 976	13, 311 6, 918	+168 -58
Interstate Commerce	O SHOULD		E. VIII
Commission Maritime Commission	1, 991 11, 464	1, 997 11, 145	-319
National Advisory Com- mittee for Aeronautics	6, 646	6, 564	-8
National Archives National Capital Housing	323	328	20
Authority	226	. 223	
and Planning Commis-	17	16	-
National Gallery of Art National Housing Agency	254 15, 769	258 15, 607	+ -16
National Labor Relations Board	792	811	+19
National Mediation Board Panama Canal	29, 693	30, 177	+10 +48
Railroad Retirement Board.	1,886	1, 885	1000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	11, 258	100	1 5,88
Securities and Exchange Commission.	1, 154	1, 138	
Smithsonian Institution	412 288	412	
Tariff Commission Tax Court of the United	119	THE LOS	
States. Tennessee Valley Author-		120	
Veterans' Administration.	13, 112 61, 445	12, 780 63, 439	
Total 3	3, 002, 258	42,988,023	
Net decrease	429, 173	429, 173	-14, 23
Grand total	9 491 491	3, 417, 196	1000

³ Includes employees stationed outside continental United States as reported by various departments and agencies excepting the War Department; totals, April 1945, 119,404; and May 1945, 121,885.

⁴ Does not include 2,097 employees reported as having left the Federal service during May and who, prior to the Lane bill, Public Law 525, would have been in a terminal leave status, and included.

⁵ Employees stationed outside continental United States reported quarterly as of Dec. 31, 1944.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1202. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of re-turning World War II veterans," known as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, approved June 22, 1944; and

S. 1203. A bill to liberalize and clarify the laws pertaining to hospital treatment, medical care, domiciliary care and related services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on

Finance

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1204. A bill to amend subsection (e) of section 3 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, to require that the approval in writing of the Secretary of Agriculture be obtained before any action is taken under such act with respect to fish or other sea food or with respect to any regulation, order, price schedule, or other requirement applicable to any processor with respect to any food or feed product processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from fish or other sea food; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MYERS: S. 1205. A bill to amend section 209 (k) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1206. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. McKELLAR (for himself and Mr. STEWART):

S. 1207. A bill to repeal the requirement of existing law that the Tennessee Valley Authority maintain its principal office in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, Alabama; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to provide for a naval academy on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF THE WAR PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 147), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved. That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, agreed to March 1, 1941; Senate Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, agreed to January 25, 1943; and Senate Resolution 55, Seventyninth Congress, first session, agreed to January 29, 1945 (relating to the investigation of the war program), is hereby increased by \$100,000.

INCREASES IN POSTAL RATES ON FIRST-CLASS MATTER—CONFERENCE PORT

Mr. GEORGE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1; and agree to the same.

WALTER F. GEORGE, DAVID I. WALSH, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, ROBERT A. TAFT, HUGH BUTLER, (Per R. T.)

Managers on the Part of the Senate. R. L. DOUGHTON. JERE COOPER. JOHN D. DINGELL, HAROLD KNUTSON, DANIEL A. REED,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia indicate what this report deals with?

Mr. GEORGE. It deals with the temporary extension of the postal rates on first-class mail matter for 2 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SALARIES OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from a bulletin issued by the National Association of Letter Carriers, referring to passage of House bill 3035, the postal salary increase bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor. Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield gladly to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Secretary of State, Mr. E. R. Stettinius, Jr., in cooperation with the American delega-tion to the United Nations Conference, performed a monumental service at San Francisco for the good of the world.

On an appropriate occasion, I desire to address the Senate on the remarkably fine service rendered by Mr. Stettinius as Secretary of State, but today, for the purpose of the RECORD, I want to insert. first, a resolution or statement adopted by his colleagues in the American delegation to the United Nations Conference which was presented to Mr. Stettinius by Chairman Connally, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I ask further permission, Mr. President, to insert, as a part of my remarks, a letter written to Mr. Stettinius by the President of the United States.

At the same time, I want to express my gratification that the work performed by Mr. Stettinius has been recognized by his appointment as the American member of the Security Council and as chairman of the United States delegation in the General Assembly. This affords an opportunity to Mr. Stettinius to implement and complete his work in effecting a plan for permanent world peace.

There being no objection, the statement of the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference and the letter addressed to Mr. Stettinius by the President of the United States were to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Statement of United States delegation to San Francisco Conference

The parchment was inscribed:

"TO EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR., SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"We who have worked as your comrades under your leadership at the San Francisco Conference wish to thank you with all our hearts for what you have done here for our country and for mankind.

"We have been very proud of your courage your determination to achieve a new world order, your unfailing persistence through moments of dark perplexity, your poise and good temper, your tactful reconciliation of those who have differed and doubted.

'We are confident that in the future you will continue to render distinguished service to the United States and the United Nations and for all these years to come we offer our warmest good wishes to the chief who has led us to the charter through the city of the Golden Gate."

(Letter addressed to Mr. Stettinius by the President of the United States)

INDEPENDENCE, Mo., June 27, 1945. DEAR ED: On the day after the death of President Roosevelt, you submitted to me your resignation as Secretary of State, I asked you to continue at your post and to carry out the vitally important assignment for which you were then completing the last preparations—to act as chairman of the United States delegation at the United Nations Conference.

You accepted that responsibility. It was a very grave responsibility. Upon the success of the San Francisco Conference depended first of all, the hope that from this war the United Nations could build a lasting peace.

The San Francisco Conference has now fulfilled its purpose. The charter of a permanent union has been written. You have every reason to be proud of your part in this achievement from the beginning.

After the request of Mr. Hull at the Moscow Conference in 1943 you, as Undersecretary of State, organized and directed the preparations for Dumbarton Oaks. You were the representative of the United States and acted as the chairman of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, where the proposals were written and became the basis of the charter. You were at your President's right hand at Yalta. where further decisions on the world organization were made and agreement to hold the United Nations Conference was reached.

All the preparations for the San Francisco Conference were under your direction. During its deliberation you served not only as chairman of the United States delegation but as president of the Conference, charged with the conduct of its business. The task of guiding the work of this Conference of 50 different nations toward unanimous agreement upon the charter was a difficult one. You accomplished it with skill, unfaltering courage, and success

But the task of fulfilling the promise of the San Francisco Conference has only just begun. The charter must be ratified and the United Nations organization brought into being and put to work. It is necessary to the future of America and the world that the words of this charter be built into the solid structure of peace for which the world is

waiting and praying.

I can think of no better way to express the confidence of the United Nations than to choose as the American representative in that task a man who has held with distinction the highest appointive office in the Government and has been more closely associated with the creation of the charter than any other.

I have asked if you would accept nomination as the representative of the United States to the United Nations, when the organization is established. As such you would

be the United States member of the security council and chairman of the United States delegation in the general assembly.

You have told me that you would accept that great responsibility.

I therefore now accept your resignation as Secretary of State.

I intend to submit the United Nations Charter to the Senate on Monday and to ask for its prompt ratification. You have told me that you feel it is of the utmost importance for you, as chairman of the United States delegation, to be immediately available to the Senate for whatever assistance and information it needs in connection with its consideration of the charter.

I wanted you to come with me to the meeting with Marshal Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill which will take place next month. But, since I shall be away during the congressional hearings, I have reluctantly agreed to your suggestion that you remain in Washington while I am away. In that capacity you will represent me before the Senate in all matters relating to the charter.

I also ask you to supervise, as the personal representative of the President, the work of the United Nations members of the preparatory commission pending ratification of the charter and your nomination as the representative of the United States to the United Nations.

I am confident that you will continue to fulfill with honor to yourself and with benefit to America and the cause of peace the high trust which your country reposes in you.

Very sincerely yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BILBO. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

manico.	*	
Aiken	George	Murdock
Austin	Gerry	Murray
Bailey	Green	Myers
Ball	Guffey	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hart	Overton
Bilbo	Hawkes	Pepper
Brewster	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hill	Revercomb
Brooks	Hoey	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	La Follette	Tunnell
Capehart	Langer	Tydings
Capper	Lucas	Vandenberg
Chavez	McClellan	Wagner
Connally	McFarland	Walsh
Cordon	McKellar	Wheeler
Donnell	McMahon	Wherry
Downey	Mead	White
Eastland	Millikin	Wiley
Ellender	Mitchell	Willis
Ferguson	Moore	
That had ab t	Money	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. Anprews] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Hatch], and the Senator from

Washington [Mr. Magnuson] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent in Europe visiting battlefields.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Mc-Carran] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Taylor] are absent as members of the committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Scrugham.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Reed], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Tobey], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Shipstead], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Wilson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. Thomas] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business by direction of the President pro tempore of the Senate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] is absent on official business of the Senate attending the funeral of the late Senator Scrugham.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORT ON UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a few hours before the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and I were to leave for San Francisco, I made a statement in the Senate respecting our mission to the United Nations Conference on International Organization for peace and security. I expressed the fervent hope that we should be able to participate in the drafting of a charter subscribed to by the participating governments and carrying the hopes of mankind for world peace. It is now my happy privilege to announce to the Senate that we have brought back to the President a comprehensive charter which we trust will meet the approval of the Senate and the people of the United States, as well as the people of all of the United Nations whose representatives were assembled at San Francisco. It is my confident belief that with ratification by the United States Senate the charter will be overwhelmingly approved by the United Nations.

It is not my purpose, today, to launch upon a formal presentation of the document to the Senate, or to take part in extended debate. It is rather my purpose to advise the Senate that the labors of the United Nations Conference at San Francisco have been concluded, and that the terms of the charter will soon be before the Senate for its formal action.

In the remarks which I shall make today, rather hastily prepared, I shall not go into great detail, or make any effort to launch a full-dress debate upon the charter. I shall be followed within a short time by the eminent Senator from Michigan, who will also address the Senate upon the outstanding features of the charter.

From the dawn of modern civilization eminent men have in vain advanced

plans to eliminate the scourge of war. Great thinkers like Dante, Grotius, William Penn, Rousseau, Bentham, and Kant, have risen to magnificent heights to formulate charters, which, in their own times, might have been effective designs for world peace. But these plans came to naught, because man lacked the imagination and the daring necessary to put them into practical effect.

In 1919 the Covenant of the League of Nations was submitted to the United States Senate. It did not receive the sanction of this body. The noble conception of that towering leader, President Woodrow Wilson, was, however, rejected. His exalted vision, his heroic efforts toward world peace and his eloquent speeches in its behalf will remain indelibly inscribed on the annals of the centuries.

Now we are confronted with another great opportunity. This time, however, the charter was not struck off by the brain of a single individual. This time the charter was conceived in the best tradition of American democracy. It has been discussed for many months throughout the length and breadth of the land. Now, finally, it has emerged in its completed form from the deliberative efforts of the representatives of 50 nations met in solemn conclave.

It is believed by numerous observers that the failure of the United States to ratify the League of Nations Covenant enfeebled the League and rendered it impotent from the beginning. Without the prestige and influence of the United States, powerful in war and powerful in peace, to many the League seemed doomed to failure from its inception. The League performed many useful acts. It composed many disputes and disagreements among the nations. It encouraged and stimulated international cooperation. Yet, on the whole, its power became weakened, not alone because of defects in its structure, but because member nations failed to utilize its opportunities. Its existence, however, was not without value to the people of the world. Its experience, its weaknesses, and even its failures have served to light the way for the organization which we are now endeavoring to establish.

The United States of America has a high and solemn responsibility with respect to the new world organization. Franklin D. Roosevelt, our late beloved and lamented President, led the way in creating the cohesive spirit of harmony and unity which has characterized the United Nations battle for freedom against the Axis Powers. And it was President Roosevelt who early conceived the plan of transforming this spirit of unity and cooperation into a positive, dynamic force for world peace and security.

The Atlantic Charter, the United Nations declaration, the Moscow declaration, and the Conferences at Cairo, Tehran, and the Crimea, together constitute a magnificent background for the calling of the Conference at Dumbarton Oaks and the Conference at San Francisco. These documents and the results of these Conferences express the hopes and expectations of the United Nations. They reflect the noble purposes and high objectives which we have in mind. Our

gallant fighting men are on the battlefields of the world today to establish and maintain these principles.

The San Francisco Conference was in session for a period of 9 weeks. Those historic days were crowded with detailed and meticulous consideration in 12 committees and 4 commissions of the Conference of the text of Dumbarton Oaks and proposals to change its terms. Literally hundreds of amendments presented by large and small states alike were carefully examined in relation to the experiences under the League of Nations and the powers and functions of the new organization. When it is remembered that delegates from 50 nations with varying historical backgrounds, speaking many tongues, and representing divergent views with respect to international problems, sat in the Conference, it is a remarkable tribute to the common ideals of the United Nations that final and unanimous agreement upon the entire document was achieved. The overwhelming desire to create an international organization for peace and security overcame such differences as arose, and they were adjusted in a spirit of conciliation and concord and unity toward the lofty objectives of the Conference.

I am confident that the American people overwhelmingly support the new charter. During the course of our deliberations thousands upon thousands of letters and telegrams poured into San Francisco demanding the effective collaboration of the United States in a world organization strong enough to keep the peace. These letters and telegrams came from every corner of these United States, from business and professional men, farmers, labor organizations, church groups, educators, young people in their teens-yes; and from mothers and fathers whose boys have poured out their blood on foreign soil in order that civilization may survive. They came from men in the armed services who are facing the embattled enemy-from men who know the sacrifices and miseries and sufferings of war and desire that their sons and their country may be spared its horrors.

Any doubt that may have existed as to the attitude of the people of the United States toward international cooperation to prevent war has long since been dispelled by the resolutions passed by both the House and the Senate and by the declaration embodied in the platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. They reflect the widespread sentiments of our people.

The United States delegation also received inspiration and assistance from our advisers and consultants in San Francisco. The consultants represented the interests of some 50 of our great national organizations—groups like the American Bar Association, the League of Women Voters, the Service clubs, farm and labor organizations, the Federal Council of Churches, and other church organizations. The consultants not only kept us in close touch with public opinion, they also advanced a number of excellent ideas, some of which were later incorporated in the charter.

The international organization which the charter establishes will include a general assembly of all member nations. in which the smallest and the weakest state will have equal power and authority with the mightiest and strongest. The assembly will constitute a democratic forum in which freedom of debate is practically unlimited and in which all of the matters within the scope of the charter or relating to any of its organs may receive the scrutiny and the discussion of the member states. It will form a world forum for the discussion of matters whatever their origin that may relate to international peace and security. Here will be hammered out on the anvil of debate the problems that may confront the organization throughout its career. Here will be formed a mighty public opinion which shall exert a tremendous influence upon the solution of all questions that relate to international peace and security. Here may be formulated recommendations to the Security Council and to the member states.

It was necessary that the executive power of the world organization should be vested in a relatively small, powerful body with authority to act speedily and decisively whenever aggression raises its ugly head. The Security Council will fulfill that function. It is endowed with wide authority in the settlement of in-ternational disputes. It will consist of 5 permanent members representing the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, and France. Six nonpermanent members will be elected by the Assembly to serve for terms of 2 years. It will be noted that while the great powers have five permanent seats on the Council, a majority of six nonpermanent members will be elected by the Assembly. When it is remembered that the population of the five permanent members is greater than that of all the remaining nations signatory to the charter, it will be perceived that a wellmaintained balance is provided.

The Security Council may receive and consider a complaint by any member or nonmember state in respect to an international dispute. Under the charter it may freely discuss and consider any such dispute. Upon this point there was for a considerable time sharp difference of opinion, but it was finally resolved in behalf of the freedom of discussion and consideration. However, with a single exception, any action of an affirmative or positive character by the Security Council requires a majority of seven votes, including the concurring votes of the five permanent members.

The Security Council has very wide powers with respect to recommending to the parties to a dispute its adjustment through peaceable measures, by negotiation, diplomacy, judicial procedure, conciliation, or arbitration. It may also suggest the particular procedure which should be adopted to compose the quarrel.

The Security Council may decide what measures short of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon members of the United Nations to apply such measures.

Let me here observe that by the signing of the charter every nation assumes the solemn and serious obligation to exert all its efforts toward peace, to contribute to the work of the council and to assume the solemn obligation which the charter imposes. These measures may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication and the severance of diplomatic relations. These are the economic sanctions. If peaceable measures fail, if the parties are unable to settle their disputes by negotiation, arbitration, or conciliation, if the Security Council deems it necessary to employ other measures, it may impose, first, economic sanctions. As I have stated, these may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations. The pressure and power of such measures and the consequent formation of a concentrated world opinion will exert a compelling influence toward settlement of the dispute.

If measures for peaceful settlement fail the Security Council may impose military sanctions. Should the Security Council consider that measures above mentioned would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such measures may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

It was the solemn judgment that while this great endeavor is in behalf of peace, while peaceful measures should be first invoked, and pressure of opinion and peaceable influences should be exerted, in order to have real authority to compose disputes there must reside somewhere in the organization the right to use military and naval forces if that should appear to be the only remedy possible under the circumstances.

In order to provide necessary naval and military forces, the charter prescribes that there shall be established a Military Staff Committee under the control and direction of the Security Coun-The Military Staff Committee, consisting of the Chiefs of Staff of the five permanant members of the Council, shall, under the direction and control of the Council, initiate the negotiation of agreements between the various nations of the organization or between groups of the nations and the organization, for supplying contingents of armed forces to be used in emergency. It is expressly stipulated that provision shall be made for the maintenance by members of the organization of air contingents which may be readily employable in case of emergency. I may observe here that agreements to provide military forces must be ratified by the respective governments; so if the charter is adopted, such agreements will ultimately come back to the Senate for action.

It was felt to be necessary that the Security Council should have wide authority with the ability to act speedily and effectively. Here lies one of the essential differences between the old League of Nations and the new world organization. The present charter proposes to combine might and right through an authority strong enough to keep the peace. The League of Nations could recommend, it could propose, it could suggest, but it was unable to take effective action to stamp out aggression.

One issue that was vigorously contested was the so-called veto in the Security Council. The provision that in all cases except procedural matters, the Security Council should act by vote of at least seven members, including all five of the permanent members, aroused substantial opposition. However, after long and thorough debate and consideration, it was determined that this provision should be maintained. This voting procedure is much more liberal than that which obtained in the League of Nations. There complete unanimity of all members of the Council on all important questions was required. Even the weakest member of the League Council could veto any action proposed.

At the historic meeting in the Crimea, President Roosevelt proposed what has become known as the Yalta voting formula for the Security Council. That formula was agreed to at Yalta. also approved at San Francisco. It was there embodied in the Dumbarton Oaks text, which was the basis of our consideration and study. It will be recalled that the original Dumbarton Oaks text did not deal with that subject. It was omitted. But when we took it up in San Francisco, the steering committee had the voting formula inserted into the body of the Dumbarton Oaks text, so it was considered as though it were a part of the original Dumbarton Oaks text. United States delegation consistently and continuously supported the formula until its final adoption. The vision and courage of President Roosevelt were justified and vindicated.

The basic thesis of the rule of unanimity—that is the term which we employ rather than "veto"-of the five permanent members of the Security Council is that so long as the great powers remain united, they shall be able to preserve the peace of the world. If the great powers should be divided-if discord should arise among them-they could not successfully preserve international peace. So long as the great powers, possessing ample material resources and military and naval might, are charged solemnly by the charter with the high responsibility of preserving the peace of the world, and remain conscious of their high duties and obligations, peace can be preserved. It must be borne in mind that'the mere existence of the veto does not mean that it will be used frequently. In all likelihood it will be seldom employed. It is not believed that it will be exercised capriciously or arbitrarily. The charter places the primary responsibility upon the Security Council and upon the five permanent members, to adopt peaceful measures to preserve the peace of the world. If there is any conscience in nations, if there is any feeling within the hearts of great powers of responsibility to the peoples of the world, I do not

believe the veto will be employed capriciously or arbitrarily. A recalcitrant member of the Security Council would be faced with the opinions of four other permanent members and perhaps six nonpermanent members. The pressure of their views would create a compelling world opinion that would make it very difficult for a single member of the Security Council alone to veto the peaceful settlement of a dispute.

I am aware of criticism leveled at the rule of unanimity. It must be remembered that the United States itself will be a permanent member of the Security Council. Our country will have the right to exercise the veto whenever in our opinion it is wise and just to do so. Our armies and navies cannot be sent into a foreign war without the consent of the United States.

The veto is something which we of the Senate must examine and approach with great candor. An effort may be made to lead our people to believe that the veto is in the charter wholly because of our allies-that they alone demand it. Were the veto not in the charter, what would some of the critics say? Would they not use the argument that American troops could be committed to combat in foreign lands without the consent of the American people? We must recognize that the Yalta formula not only gives the other great powers a veto over military action; it gives the United States of America that same veto.

The United Nations Charter is based on the fundamental assumption that in the shrinking world in which we live world peace is indivisible. We all realize, however, that under certain circumstances it may prove desirable to have disputes of a regional or local character settled by regional peace machinery. The charter makes ample provision for such regional arrangements to function under the general supervision of the Security Council. Thus the ground work is laid so that the Act of Chapultepec and our inter-American peace machinery in general can be properly integrated into the over-all world organization. Neither the effectiveness of the inter-American system nor the authority of the United Nations organization will be impaired.

While I have dwelt at some length on the Security Council, I desire to make it clear that we should not place all our emphasis on the security functions of the new organization. For no matter how carefully we build the machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes, we cannot ignore constructive steps to consider the social and economic causes of war.

To that end the charter provides for an Economic and Social Council, which is authorized to set up a number of commissions to aid in the solution of international social, economic, cultural, and humanitarian problems and to promote regard for human rights and fundamental freedoms. In their respective fields the commissions will initiate studies and make reports. They may also make recommendations in respect to such matters to the General Assembly and to the member states. Neither the commissions nor the Economic and Social Council will have any authority or power to im-

pose upon any state any regulation or provision whatsoever. The final choice and decision in respect to all such recommendations will remain with each individual state.

The old mandates system under the League of Nations has been abandoned and a system of trusteeships created. Distinction is made between territories within strategic areas and those in non-strategic areas. It is also provided that the welfare of the dependent peoples in such areas shall be taken into account and measures adopted looking to their improvement and ultimate self-government.

Great care was exercised in protecting the interests of the United States in territories from which our savage enemies were expelled at the cost of so many lives of our gallant and intrepid soldiers and sailors. It was our earnest endeavor to safeguard and protect the security and vital defense of the United States and world peace. I may here allude to the fact that we had constantly sitting at our side admirals and generals from the Army and Navy, counseling with us with respect to these matters; and it was with their assurance that our vital interests in self-defense were protected that we consented to these provisions.

The International Court of Justice constitutes the fifth great arm or agency of the new organization. Whereas the Security Council is primarily designed to handle political disputes, the Court will be called upon to adjust differences of a legal or justiciable nature. The new Court is patterned closely after the old Permanent Court of International Justice which functioned so satisfactorily during the two decades prior to the outbreak of World War II. Jurisdiction will be optional on the part of any party to a dispute. On the other hand, where disputes are referred to the Court or where a state accepts the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court in certain categories of cases, its decisions are, of course, binding upon the parties. I may say here that a nation may file a consent to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court in a case, as in all cases, or it may reserve that right, and only file its consent in particular cases, or not accept the jurisdiction at all, unless it so desires.

The American people have traditionally stood for the great ideal involved in the settlement of disputes according to the principles of law and justice. They will, I am sure, wholeheartedly approve the new Court as a vital and essential part of the world organization. The statute of the Court has already received wide approval among the members of the American Bar.

The United Nations organization must be allowed to grow and develop. It must possess sufficient flexibility to meet the changing needs of the time.

The charter wisely contains provisions for the submission and adoption of amendments to the charter and for the calling of a constitutional conference for its general review.

Any modification of the present charter recommended by a two-thirds vote of the conference shall take effect when ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two-

thirds of the members of the organization, including all the permanent members of the Security Council. There can be no valid claim that we are becoming a member of an organization which may assume new and unforeseen powers binding upon us without our consent.

At San Francisco there was splendid unity and harmony within the United States delegation. On all matters the delegation voted as a unit. Such minor differences as existed were adjusted within the delegation, and we presented a united front.

Hon. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State and head of the United States Delegation, was elected president of the Conference and presided with much distinction and efficiency. leadership and management were outstanding and he deserves high credit and praise for the masterly manner in which he led the United States delegation and in which he directed the affairs of the entire Conference.

Secretary Hull, who was designated as senior adviser, unfortunately could not attend the sessions at San Francisco. We sorely missed him. Over the years he has rendered heroic service in the cause of peace. He aided in drawing the Dumbarton Oaks document, and it was a source of real and abiding regret on the part of the United States delegation that he was unable because of illness to take part in our deliberations. However, his counsel and advice were often conveyed by telephone, to the great benefit of the delegation. We were frequently in contact with him over the long-distance telephone.
Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, a

high-ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, worked diligently as a member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee which conferred frequently with Secretary Hull in laying the foundations of a world organization for peace. He supported heartily the resolution calling for international cooperation adopted by the Senate in

1943 by a vote of 85 to 5.

At San Francisco, Senator VANDEN-BERG contributed his great abilities to the success of the Conference. The freedom of debate secured to the General Assembly was achieved through his labors. He was influential and forceful in securing the provisions establishing regional arrangements. He gave to the general work of the Conference his large experience in public affairs and in the field of foreign relations. He deserves the thanks of his countrymen for his fine and valuable service.

Representative Sol Bloom, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, discharged his duties with fine ability and zeal. His extensive service and experience in parliamentary processes contributed substantially to the work of the Conference. On the committees and commissions dealing with the General Assembly and trusteeships. he rendered signal service.

Representative CHARLES A. EATON, ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, approached his duties in a fine spirit and a lofty view. Although suffering from illness at various times during the Confer-

ence, he gave unsparingly of his wisdom and experience in the work of the Conference. He gave particular attention to the committee dealing with the general provisions of the charter. They related to the amendment, withdrawal processes, the international secretariat, and the other principal organs of the United Nations organization.

Commander Harold Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota and on leave from the Navy, gave generously of his splendid abilities. The provisions relating to trusteeships were primarily shaped and fashioned through his efforts. With industry and energy he gave attention to many parts of the charter. He made valuable suggestions and contributions to the work of the Conference and is entitled to much praise and credit for his achievements.

Dean Virginia Gildersleeve, of Barnard College, brought to her work at the Conference a veritable wealth of experience in the field of economic and social activity. She rendered outstanding service with regard to the social and economic council, and in connection with the preamble to the charter. She made a distinct contribution to the Conference, and the women of the United States have just cause for pride in her accomplishments.

Of course, I also took part in the Conference from time to time. [Laughter.] That statement is an interlineation. It adds nothing to my earlier remarks. merely thought at this time that I should

mention it. [Laughter.]

Our delegation leaned heavily on the experience and wisdom of our former great colleague and leader, President Harry Truman, who so recently assumed the heavy responsibilities of the Presidency. Though the conference was held at the time when he was laboring with huge new problems that confronted him, his breadth of vision and his keen insight into world problems were a constant source of inspiration and encouragement. His superb leadership guided us in our deliberations. Not a day passed but what the delegation conferred with President Truman by telephone.

The scope of agreement reached at San Francisco has been remarkable, and notwithstanding divergent views and earnest attachment to differing concepts, final and complete agreement was reached on the entire charter. This was true because all the 50 nations at San Francisco aspired to the same sublime goal which called the Conference into

Its adoption marks an epochal period in international affairs. It creates an agency of tremendous influence and power. The future course of history may be affected by its conduct and by its heroic efforts in behalf of peace. However, it creates no superstate. The rights and powers of individual states are not impaired, except to the extent of the obligations and duties which they voluntarily assume when they sign the charter.

Its strength rests upon cooperation and community of interest in providing collective security. A heavy responsibility rests upon every member of the organization not only to use its own powers and efforts to promote the in-

terests of the organization, but it assumes a duty to further the purposes and principles of the organization. This sense of responsibility, this compelling duty, will generate a desire for peace, a will to live on terms of amity with the other peoples of the earth.

While the completed charter reflects the united opinion of the peace-loving nations of the earth, I do not proclaim it as embodying perfection. It could not be expected that 50 nations could agree upon a document whose every line and paragraph and phrase would meet universal approval. However, the charter marks a significant beginning. It will grow and develop in the light of experience and according to the needs of nations under international law and justice and freedom. These principles are embodied in the charter in luminous and moving words. The charter must be judged not in its dissected parts, not in its dismembered and mutilated clauses and phrases, but it must be judged as an integrated body, complete in its organs and functions. Judged by that standard, it is a monumental performance.

documents, language, Mere phrases cannot themselves prevent war and preserve peace. They must rest upon the will and the purpose and the desires of the peoples and nations of the world. Organization, however, promotes these objectives. It stimulates and quickens high purposes by the knowledge that others share those ends. Enlightened and compelling world opinion in behalf of law and justice and freedom and peace will give life and vigor to documents and charters.

The charter cannot have vitality, it cannot breathe, it cannot act until ratified by the Senate of the United States. The fate of the charter rests here in the Senate. No treaty can attain the force of law for our people until it passes the scrutiny and receives the sanction of this body. When it votes, it votes by authority of the people. Its action is not the individual action of each member. Its action is that of the entire citizenship of the Republic. President Truman will soon submit the treaty to the Senate and urge its early ratification. Without any desire to limit or curtail legitimate debate, I earnestly hope that the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the treaty at the earliest possible moment. It is my earnest hope that the Senate in its wisdom, with a high purpose to preserve the peace, not only our own peace but the peace of the world, and with a desire to serve all humankind, will give its speedy approval to the charter and thus give it impulse among the other nations of the earth.

Early ratification here will stimulate and encourage ratification by other nations. The eyes of the entire world are centered on what we do here. Foreign nations know that the United Nations Organization for Peace and Security will face failure and futility unless the United States is a member. We face a high and solemn responsibility. The fate of world peace may depend upon our decision.

Senators who object to international cooperation for any purpose will vote "no." Those who prefer that we go alone will reject the charter. It is my sincere

belief that those who believe in cooperation with other nations in an effort to avert the horrors and miseries of war, to suppress aggression and conquest, and to enthrone the rule of law and reason and justice in international relations will vote to ratify the treaty.

While we never lost sight of the supreme objective of world peace and security, we do not neglect our national interests. The rights and sovereignty of the United States are not imperiled. We must remember, however, that world peace will cost something. It is worth something. It will cost cooperation. It will cost the will to peace. The charter is not automatic. It must be supported. It will cost our constant efforts and influence in the cause of peace.

Twice in the span of a lifetime the world has been cursed by global wars. Millions of lives of the gallant and the brave have been sacrificed upon red and blazing battlefields or have been engulfed in the oceans' depths. Other millions have suffered privations, hardships, and starvation. Countless children have been orphaned, and misery and suffering have reached out into many lands. Some of the fairest regions of earth have been devastated. Unnumbered homes have been laid in ashes, and billions of dollars of wealth have been destroyed. The tragic war in which we are now engaged

has spread its horrors to distant parts of the earth. There have been more marching men than composed the combined armies of Alexander, Hannibal, Caesar, Genghis Kahn, Napoleon, and all of the other gory conquerors of the past.

We have crushed Nazi Germany at a terrible cost in blood and treasure. Our heroic fighting men are now carrying victory over our brutal and savage enemy, Japan. Complete triumph is assured. Our banners shall wave over Tokyo. Such another world tragedy must not occur again. Our sons must not be sacrificed upon an altar of blood. War must be prevented before it breaks upon us in its bloody fury. Aggressors must be chained. The monster with a sword must be dethroned. The methods of peace must be enthroned.

War can be prevented by international cooperation. In the charter we have endeavored to construct the mechanism to create that cooperation for peace. The 50 nations who have signed the United Nations Charter have pledged their honor to promote the cause of peace and to support the organization. The general assembly is an open forum for discussion and the formation of world opinion with power to make recommendations. The Security Council is a compact and powerful body charged with the duty of first invoking judicial and other peaceable measures in the settlement of disputes.

Finally, it is invested with authority, if necessary, to preserve or restore international peace, to impose economic or military sanctions. The charter is the best document that the wisdom of the peace-loving nations of the world could devise. It is a noble beginning. It offers the world's best hope to outlaw war and to ordain peace. It is a star in the night. It is a gleaming beacon in a troubled and gloomy sky.

The United States, our country, my country, your country, Mr. President, has been singularly blessed by a generous Providence. Rich in material resources which have been marvelously developed by a free and enterprising people, living under the institutions of liberty, and possessing tremendous naval and military power, she stands in the forefront of the nations of the earth.

But our strength does not lie alone in material things. Our power in the world does not depend alone upon the might of our Armies and Navies. Moral and men-tal and spiritual resources may influence and direct the course of human history. In these fields we have achieved mightily. For 150 years our Constitution and its institutions of freedom and democracy have quickened aspirations for liberty wherever men have hungered for freedom. In international affairs, we have never followed the course of aggression or conquest. We assured Cuba her freedom. The Philippines are witnesses to their independence. We came out of World War I with no added territory, guiltless of indemnities and reparations.

With such a noble heritage, the United States has a supreme destiny. We have the opportunity to lead the nations of earth away from the cruel wager of battle into the ways of peace. The United States must employ its tremendous national power to lead and cooperate with other nations to curb aggressors and to crush and overwhelm savage attacks upon peaceful peoples.

May the Senate proceed with ratification immediately. The United Nations have fought as comrades in the mightiest war in the long and bloody annals of the centuries. Our manpower and material resources have been marshaled upon the land and in the air and on the sea until our banners have waved in triumph.

The central idea of the charter is that the comradeship of war must be carried forward in a comradeship of peace. If we have been able to fight side by side in killing and destroying, why shall we not league together to save millions of human lives and permit the peoples of the earth to rebuild their tortured lands and to recreate wasted wealth and shattered

We leagued our armed might for war. Now let us league our moral and material might for peace.

The United States will not reject the clear and challenging call to this high duty. Let us rise to our lofty destiny. Let us be among the architects of a structure more marvelous than one built of steel and stone. Let us create a temple of law and reason and justice and peace to serve the peoples of the world.

The world charter for peace is knocking at the doors of the Senate. shall not turn it away.

There come ringing down through a century and a half the inspired words of Washington as he stood before the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and blessed the new Republic that was being launched upon the earth. Washington

Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair; the event is in the hands of God.

[Prolonged applause, Senators rising.]

NOTICE OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor. Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for just a moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the

Senator from Michigan? Mr. BILBO. I do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to give notice that, if I may be recognized tomorrow noon when the Senate meets, I should like to continue the discussion of the San Francisco Charter.

WAR AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3368) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President-The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, yesterday evening at the time the Senate took a

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The clerk will call the

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Murdock
Austin	Gerry	Murray
Bailey	Green	Myers
Ball	Guffey	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hart	Overton
Bilbo	Hawkes	Pepper
Brewster	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hill	Revercomb
Brooks	Hoev	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	La Follette	Tunnell
Capehart	Langer	Tydings
Capper	Lucas	Vandenberg
Chavez	McClellan	Wagner
Connally	McFarland	Walsh
Cordon	McKellar	Wheeler
Donnell	McMahon	Wherry
Downey	Mead	White
Eastland	Millikin	Wiley
Ellender	Mitchell	Willis
Ferguson	Moore	San and the san an
Fulbright	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventysix Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me in order that I may report and have considered several resolutions from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, before responding to the request of the Senator from Illinois. I wish to make an observation and have an understanding. I am fully aware of the parliamentary rule that if, while a Senator is speaking, he yields to another who desires to have a measure passed or to introduce something, or even for a quorum call, he loses the floor. Heretofore we have been following the practice of giving our consent to have such things done and permitting the Senator having the floor to retain it after the requests have been fulfilled. I wish to know whether, if I yield for these different matters, I shall retain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator will retain the floor after yielding for a specific purpose.

Mr. BILBO. The Chair will hold that,

will he?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.
Mr. GUFFEY. I shall object any time
the Senator yields. If I have the right to
object to this, I object.

Mr. BILBO. Object to what?

Mr. GUFFEY. The request the Sena-

tor is yielding to now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has already ruled. The Chair asked whether there was objection, and said that without objection the Senator would retain the floor.

Mr. BILBO. I would rather have the ruling of the Chair than the objection of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

EXPENSES OF HEARINGS BEFORE COM-MITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding. There are a few resolutions which are important which I desire to have agreed to, and I think the Senate should consider them at this time.

From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably Senate Resolution 132, submitted on June 7 last by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, seeking an additional appropriation to carry on the general work of the committee. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 132) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, authorized by Senate Resolution 9, agreed to January 6, 1945, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, for the same purposes, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, \$10,000 in addition to the amount of \$5,000 heretofore authorized.

EXPENSES OF HEARINGS BEFORE COM-MITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably Senate Resolution 133, submitted on June 7, 1945, by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. George], acting chairman, at the time, of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The resolution requests an additional \$5,000 to carry on the work of the committee. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 133) was read, considered, and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, authorized by Senate Resolution 9, agreed to January 6, 1945, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, for the same purposes, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, \$5,000 in addition to the amount of \$5,000 heretofore authorized.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF MOBILIZATION OF NATIONAL RE-SOURCES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably Senate Resolution 146, reported from the Committee on Military Affairs by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Kilgore] on June 26, 1945. The resolution seeks merely to continue the provisions of Senate Resolution 107 until the present Congress shall adjourn. It asks for no money. I request immediate consideration for the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 146) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the provisions of Senate Resolution 107 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, continued by Senate Resolution 46 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, authorizing an investigation by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs of the possibilities of better mobilizing the national resources of the United States, be, and the same are hereby, continued in full force and effect during the remainder of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

EXPENSES OF HEARINGS BEFORE SPE-CIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably Senate Resolution 147, submitted today by the Senator from New York [Mr. Mead], which increases the limit of expenses under Senate Resolution 71, which was adopted in the 77th Congress. This request comes from the Senator from New York and his committee, which is a special committee set up by the Senate, requesting an additional \$100,000 to carry on its work. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 147) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, agreed to March 1, 1941; Senate Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, agreed to January 25, 1943; and Senate Resolution 55, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, agreed to January 29, 1945 (relating to the investigation of the war program) is hereby increased by \$100,000.

MARY A. MURPHY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably Senate Resolution 137, submitted by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] on June 19, 1945. It authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Senate to pay out of the contingent fund 1 year's compensation to the widow of the late Edward V. Murphy, Jr., who was for some 24½ years clerk on journal work for the Congressional Record.

Mr. President, this is not quite in line with precedent, because we usually pay the widows of deceased clerks only 6 months' compensation, but due to the long and unusual and fine service rendered by Mr. Murphy, the committee thought it was desirable to pay the full year's compensation. Not later than January 20, 1938, the Senate went on record by paying Mrs. Nellie S. Wick, the widow of James R. Wick, a full year's salary, and as I recall, Mr. Wick's service was of about the same length as Mr. Murphy's. Also on May 28, 1942, we took the same course for the widow of the late Percy E. Budlong, who was one of the official reporters of debates of the Senate for more than 25 years. So I feel that we are within our rights so far as precedent is concerned in asking that the widow of Mr. Murphy be paid a full year's compensation.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered, and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Mary A. Murphy, widow of Edward V. Murphy, Jr., late clerk on journal work for the Congressional Record, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving from the Senate and from the Official Reporters of Debates at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PAYMENTS FROM THE CONTINGENT FUND IN CONNECTION WITH INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably Senate Resolution 77. I respectfully request the attention of the Senate to this resolution. It was submitted by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, on February 15, 1945. In substance the resolution provides that when an investigation is requested to be made, and money to conduct the investigation is requested from the contingent fund, if the expenses are in excess of \$5,000 there shall be submitted to the committee a budget, in such form as the committee may require, setting forth the estimate of expenses proposed to be incurred for personal services, hearings, and travel, and such other information as the committee may

require. That, briefly, is what section 1 provides.

Section 2 of the resolution deals with the personnel employed at present by committees, which is loaned or borrowed Government departments from The section specifically provides that when a special committee borrows personnel from a Government department or agency it shall be the duty of such special committee to reimburse the Government department or agency out of the funds which have been appropriated by the Senate for the investigation before such personnel is authorized to work for the special committee. This takes effect January 1, 1946.

I ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 77), submitted by Mr. Wherry on February 15, 1945, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate shall not (1) authorize the payment from the contingent fund of the Senate of the expenses, in excess of \$5,000, of any inquiry or investiga-tion hereafter authorized, or (2) increase the amount heretofore authorized to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate in connection with any inquiry or investiga-tion, unless, prior to adoption of the resolution authorizing such payment or provid-ing for such increase, the committee or subcommittee thereof authorized to conduct such inquiry or investigation shall have submitted to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate a budget, in such form as the committee may require, setting forth its estimates of expenses proposed to be incurred for personal services, hearings, and travel, and such other information as the committee may require.

SEC. 2. Whenever the head of any department or agency of the Government shall have detailed or assigned personnel of such department or agency to the staff of any Senate committee or subcommittee thereof, the appropriations of such department or agency from which the personnel so assigned or detailed is paid shall be reimbursed from funds available to the committee or sub-committee prior to the detail or assignment in the amount of the salaries of such personnel while on such detail or assignment; and the services of any personnel so detailed or assigned shall not be accepted or utilized unless, at the time of such detail or assignment, funds are available to such committee or subcommittee for the reimbursement of appropriations, as herein provided, for the period of such detail or assignment.

SEC. 3. The foregoing provisions of this resolution shall become effective on January 1, 1946.

SEC. 4. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is authorized to make such studies as may be necessary to enable it to prescribe uniform requirements as to the form and content of budgets required to be submitted under the first section of this resolution and otherwise to carry out its functions under such section.

INVESTIGATION OF DISPOSAL OF SUR-PLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND RELATED SUBJECTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I report one more resolution from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I report favorably Senate Resolution 129, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The resolution was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'Mahoney] on May 31, 1945. I desire the Senator from Wyoming to explain the resolution to the Senate. It provides for an appropriation of \$25,000. The resolution was passed over temporarily by our committee, but we believe the Senate ought to consider it now. I may say that there may be some slight misapprehension with respect to this resolution. That is why I request that the Senator from Wyoming make explanation of it.

When the resolution came before our committee we were advised that a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee, of which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is chairman, had been engaged last year in the investigation of surplus property in the Midwest. We were also advised at the time that the Mead committee had full authority to make every conceivable kind of investigation with respect to surplus property, and was so engaged at the present time. It appeared to the members of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate that the resolution in question sought authority for another committee to engage in the investigation of surplus property. It seemed to the committee that three committees should not be investigating surplus property.

I may say, Mr. President, that some day the Senate must determine whether it will permit various committees to investigate the same subject over and over again. I submit that the time has arrived when some committee of the Senate will have to determine what committee has jurisdiction over a particular subject matter involved in a resolution, and if the committee which has authority to make such determination finds that another committee is then investigating the subject matter which it is sought to have reinvestigated by another committee, that that committee should rule that only one committee may investigate the subject matter in

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 129), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcom-mittee thereof, is authorized and directed to continue the study and investigation with respect to war contracts, the termination of war contracts and related problems authorized by Senate Resolution 198, of the Seventyeighth Congress, as heretofore supplemented and extended, to be conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, and is further authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the disposal of surplus Government property and related The committee shall report to problems. the Senate, from time to time, the results of its studies and investigations under this resolution, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

The powers and duties conferred or imposed

The powers and duties conferred or imposed by Senate Resolution 198, of the Seventyeigth Congress, with respect to the study and investigation under that resolution shall also be applicable with respect to the studies and investigations under this resolution. The subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs heretofore authorized to make the study and investigation under Senate Resolution 198, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, shall be deemed to have been continued as a subcommittee duly authorized to make the studies and investigations under this resolution until the Committee on Military Affairs shall otherwise direct.

For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. LUCAS. I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from Illinois has given me this opportunity to set forth on the floor of the Senate the views of the Committee on Military Affairs with respect to this resolution. I may say that I agree completely with everything the Senator from Illinois has stated. There should not be a multiplicity of special committees investigating and reinvestigating the same or similar matters.

Perhaps a word or two of explanation with respect to what has happened in regard to surplus property may be worth while at this point. Members of the Senate will recall that long before the Congress passed a law dealing with the disposal of surplus property, agencies of the Government were engaged in such disposal. Complaints were coming from all parts of the country with respect to the manner in which disposal was being carried on. There was, however, no law dealing with the subject. It was a perfectly natural thing then, in those circumstances, that complaints of this character should go to what was then the Truman committee, a special committee appointed by the Congress for the very laudable purpose of surveying and investigating the expenditure of war funds. The Truman committee, and later the Mead committee, conducted these investigations and did excellent work. I think the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is to be complimented on the results of the work of that committee in preventing the activities of flyby-night organizations which were created to deal speculatively in Government surplus property.

However, while all this was going on, as the result of the studies of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. George] is the chairman, and as the result of the work of the Military Affairs Committee operating through a subcommittee on war contracts, a bill was drafted and introduced. It was discussed in the committee and was passed by both Houses

of Congress. The Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and of the House were instrumental in bringing a certain amount of order out of chaos by writing a surplus property act. That act provided, among other things, that the Surplus Property Board, which was set up in the law as a policy-making agency, should make report to Congress with respect to the disposal of Government plants and facilities of various kinds and charter. It was the feeling of the Committee on Military Affairs that the handling of such plants in the postwar period might make or break the economic system of the United States. The committee felt that unless these plants were kept in a reasonable degree of continuous operation we might be confronted with the closing down of plants and the creation of a serious problem of unemploy-

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Surplus Property Disposal Board have jurisdiction over the disposition of plants under the control of the Army?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has the power to dispose of all plants which were built by Government money, including Army and Navy plants, when they are declared

to be surplus.

Mr. WALSH. I so understood. This subject has been under consideration by the Committee on Naval Affairs, and there is a bill pending to require the Navy Department to submit to the Naval Affairs Committees of the House and Senate its declaration of plants as surplus. It is not intended to interfere with the Surplus Property Board, but the bill provides that the information that particular plants which have been under the jurisdiction of the Navy or have been financed by the Navy have been declared to be surplus shall be furnished to the Naval Affairs Committees of the House and Senate before authority is given the Surplus Property Board to dispose of the property. I wonder if there is such a provision with respect to the Army.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No such bill has

come to my attention.

Mr. WALSH. As the Senator knows, no acquisition of property by the Army or Navy can be made without the consent of Congress; and there is a feeling on the part of the House and Senate Committees on Naval Affairs that no disposition of property should be made without the approval of Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was pre-cisely the feeling of the Committee on

Military Affairs.

Mr. WALSH. The bill to which I have referred does not go quite so far as that; but it goes so far as to require information as to the disposition of property. I thought the Senator might be interested in that recently proposed legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very much interested, because what the Senator from Massachusetts says illustrates the concern of the Naval Affairs Committees of the House and Senate in having full knowledge of what is being done.

Mr. WALSH. We do not attempt to control disposition of the property once

it gets into the hands of the Surplus Property Board, but we are seeking to require that Congress shall be informed when any property is declared to be sur-

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely. That indicates the point which I am trying to emphasize, namely, the supreme importance to the economy of this country of Congress knowing what is being done with the tremendous investment of public money in the construction of plants. More than \$16,000,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States has been invested in the construction of facilities in a dozen different categories, including synthetic fuel plants, high octane gasoline plants, aluminum and magnesium plants, radio facilities, and other categories of plants built by the money of the people of the United States. If those plants are disposed of without the knowledge of the people of the United States, who knows what danger may be involved?

It was with that thought in mind that section 19 was written into the Surplus Property Disposal Act. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the entire text of section 19. I shall read only a portion.

There being no objection, section 19 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD,

as follows:

DISPOSAL OF PLANTS

SEC. 19. (a) The Board, in cooperation with the various disposal agencies, shall prepare and submit to the Congress within 3 months after enactment of this act, a report as to each of the following classes of surplus property (not including any plant which cost the Government less than \$5,000,000): (1) Aluminum plants and facilities; (2) magnesium plants and facilities; (3) synthetic-rubber plants and facilities; (4) chemical plants and facilities; (5) aviation-gasoline plants and facilities; (6) iron and steel plants and facilities; (7) pipe lines and facilities used for transporting oil; (8) patents, processes, techniques, and inventions, except such as are necessary to the operation of the plants and facilities herein listed; (9) aircraft plants and facilities and aircraft and aircraft parts; (10) shipyards and facilities; (11) transportation facilities; and (12) radio and electrical equipment:

(A) Describing the amount, cost, and location of the property and setting forth other descriptive information relative to the use

of the property;
(B) Outlining the economic problems that may be created by disposition of the prop-

(C) Setting forth a plan or program for the care and handling, disposition, and use of the property consistent with the policies and

objectives set forth in this act.

(b) In the event that it is not possible within such period to prepare and submit a complete report to the Congress as to any class of property, the Board shall submit an interim report 3 months after the enactment of this act, and shall submit a complete report as soon thereafter as possible. If the Board determines that it is desirable to alter or change any such plan or program or to prepare a report on any other class of property, it shall prepare in accordance with the provisions of this subsection and submit to the Congress an additional report, setting forth the altered or changed plan or program or a plan or program relating to the

new class of property.

(c) Whenever the Board may deem it to be in the interest of the objectives of this

act it may authorize the disposition of any surplus property listed in classes 9 to 12, inclusive, of subsection (a) of this section. With respect to the property listed in classes 1 to 8, inclusive, no disposition shall be made or authorized until 30 days after such report (or additional report) has been made while Congress is in session, except that the Board may authorize any disposal agency to lease any such property for a term of not more than 5 years.

(d) The Board may authorize any disposal agency to dispose of any materials or equipment related to any surplus plant covered by this section, if such materials and equipment are not necessary for the operation of the plant in the manner for which it is designed.

(e) This section shall not apply to any Government-owned equipment, structure, or other property operated as an integral part of a privately owned plant and not capable of economic operation as a separate and independent unit.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I read a portion of section 19 of the Surplus Property Disposal Act:

The Board-

Meaning the Surplus Property Boardin cooperation with the various disposal agencies, shall prepare and submit to the Congress within 3 months after the enactment of this act, a report as to each of the following classes of surplus property (not including any plant which cost the Government less than \$5,000,000):

Then there are listed 12 categories, namely, aluminum plants, magnesium plants, synthetic-rubber plants, chemical plants, aviation-gasoline plants, iron and steel plants, pipe lines, patents, aircraft plants, shipyards, transportation facilities, and radio and electrical equipment.

It is provided in section 19 that these reports shall contain information describing the amount, cost, and location of the property, outlining the economic problems which may be created by the disposition of the property, and setting forth a plan or program for the care and handling, disposition, and use of the

property.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that that law became effective on October 3, 1944. The report provided for in the act has not yet been submitted. I do not blame the Surplus Property Board, because there were great difficulties involved in the creation of that Board. Two members of the Board were nominated. Their nominations were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The Committee on Military Affairs spent weeks in a careful examination of the qualifications of the nominees. I invite attention particularly to the fact that it was the standing Committee on Military Affairs which had jurisdiction over those nominations, just as it was the standing Committee on Military Affairs which reported the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The resolution which is under consideration directs the committee "to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the disposal of surplus Government property and related problems. The committee shall report to the Senate, from time to time, the results of its studies and investigations under this resolution, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable."

What I wish to ask the able Senator is whether he believes that under that language the Committee on Military Affairs, which is one of the standing legislative committees of the Senate, would have full power or authority to make any type or kind of investigation with respect to the disposition of surplus property?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Under that language it certainly would have. The resolution was drafted by the drafting service of the Senate. The purpose was, of course, to continue the powers which had been previously vested in the special subcommittee headed by the distin-guished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. At the beginning of this session the Senator from Montana resigned as chairman of that subcommittee, and without solicitation upon my part I was made chairman of the subcommittee. It was the express desire of the chairman of the subcommittee and of the chairman of the full committee, as fell as of other members, that I accept the responsibility of continuing this work.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that, in conformity with what I understood to be the desire of the leadership of the Senate, and in conformity with what I deemed to be sound practice in senatorial committee work, I directed that this resolution be drafted in such form that the subcommittee should not be an independent entity, but should operate under the authority of the full Committee on Military Affairs. Moreover, it was so drafted that all expenditures would have to be made by authority of the chairman of the committee, or the chairman of the subcommittee, if he were designated for that purpose by the chairman. In other words, every care was taken in drafting this resolution to place in the hands of the standing committee, which has jurisdiction over such legislation, the responsibility of keeping in touch with the policy of disposal of surplus property. If any amendment of the act is suggested. it will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with what the Senator says with respect to a standing committee pursuing any investigation of this kind which it undertakes. I believe that is the way the Senate intended these investigations to be conducted—rather than by special committees, unless something unusual is involved or is developed.

My last observation in connection with the resolution is adopted and the Military Affairs Committee takes jurisdiction over the investigation of all matters pertaining to surplus property, it seems to be that the special committees which have heretofore been taking jurisdiction ought to confer with the Senator's committee and inform it what they have done up to the present time, the special committees should then cease and desist, and permit

the Committee on Military Affairs to have complete jurisdiction over surplus property disposal. Witnesses from the various departments should not be brought here one day to testify before one committee, the second day to testify before another committee, and the third day to testify before the subcommittee of the Senator from Wyoming. I think the Senator will agree with me on that matter

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree that we should so conduct our affairs in the Senate as to conserve the time and the energy of the various agencies.

Let me say, furthermore, with respect to the amount of money which was provided for in the resolution as reported by the Committee on Military Affairs—namely, \$25,000—that the purpose of writing that provision into the measure was to enable the Committee on Military Affairs to stand upon its own feet and to employ its own staff, not to be dependent on any agency outside the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the Senator that what he has just said expresses my sentiments. It is in line with the resolution, adopted a moment ago, which was offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Wherry]. Certainly the Senate should have the courage, when it adopts a resolution of this kind, to appropriate sufficient money to enable the employment of the staff which is needed if the investigation is to be carried on, rather than to have to depend upon an agency of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to make a statement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. With regard to this resolution, I should like to make a brief statement. The Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, of which I have the honor to be chairman, early undertook three rather exhaustive studies. The first relates to contract termination, plant clearance, and so forth; the second relates to surplus property disposal; and the third relates to reconversion and demobilization.

I introduced jointly with the Senator from Montana [Mr. Murray], who at that time was head of a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, two or three bills. The legislation which was recommended by the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning found expression in the first bill, namely, the bill providing for contract termination and settlement, plant clearance, and so forth. Controversy arose over the second bill, which reached the floor of the Senate, but finally a bill which was reported by the Finance Committee was in substance passed. It related to demobilization and reconver-The third bill related to surplus sion. property disposal, the matter now under discussion. That bill, of course, went to the legislative committee having jurisdiction, to wit, the Committee on Military Affairs, as the first-mentioned bill likewise did. The bill relating to surplus property disposal, which actually passed the Senate, was in many respects unlike the bill I introduced, but I still assumed that the special committee-not being a legislative committee, but a policy committee-retained its interest in the general subject, and I urge upon the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming that when he becomes chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, he likewise being a member of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, he follow this subject of surplus-property disposal, because I realized when we passed the bill, Mr. President—I think I may say frankly as expressing my own view—that the legislation was by no means perfect. It was so recognized by the proponents of the particular measure which passed the Senate and finally came out of conference, because it provided expressly for reports from the Board when it should be set up and organized.

So it was at my request, in part, acting with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, that the legislative committee renewed its interest in this particular phase—and it is a very important one—of our general economic picture.

eral economic picture.

I should have gladly placed at his disposal any staff which was available to me as chairman of the special committee, but that committee has never organized a large staff; in fact, it has followed a policy of not organizing a regular staff, but of simply organizing temporarily a very meager staff to do special jobs.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him, so that I may point out that the Senator designated me to be chairman of a Special Subcommittee on Industrial Reorganization of his full committee.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That subcommittee, upon which sit the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] and the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Austin], has on several occasions held joint sessions with the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee for the precise purpose of avoiding duplication of demands upon the time of executive officers of the Government.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Wyoming is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should also add that the staff of the Special Committee on Postwar Policy and Planning has participated in all those hearings and has contributed materially to the work of the two subcommittees.

Mr. GEORGE. I was about to add that, Mr. President. I should like to say that the legislative committee which has charge of this general subject is the Committee on Military Affairs, and that is where the legislation has to be shaped, of course. I do not think there is any more important question before the Congress, or any more important question, really, before the country at this time, than the proper disposition of the vast amount of surplus property accumulating in connection with the prosecution of this war. Therefore, I was particularly interested, with the chairman of the

subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, in not only pursuing but in keeping in constant touch with the developments, because my own view now is that some additional legislation undoubtedly will be enacted before the surplus property problem can properly be handled.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, I may add that the members of the Surplus Property Board have indicated to me their desire to have an opportunity to come before this committee at intervals for the purpose of laying before the Congress and the country the plans and methods they have in mind.

Let me add one more word, Mr. President, and I shall be through. I wish to have the Senate understand that the Committee on Military Affairs and this subcommittee do not conceive their duty to be of an inquisitorial character. There is no purpose on the part of this committee to hale officers of the executive branch of the Government before it for the purpose of creating a Roman holiday. Nor is there any purpose on the part of the committee, or any member of it, to bring before it members of industry for the purpose of harassing or intimidating them. The whole concept of the study is a constructive one and not an investigatorial one. We are looking toward the prevention of evils and mistakes rather than to the investigation of mistakes which have already been made. So, Mr. President, the committee should not be regarded as one which will only investigate. It is a committee which will study the proper policy which the Government should follow. I believe that although the duties are onerous, and I should personally very much welcome being shorn of responsibility in connection with them: nevertheless, I conceive of no duty which the Congress owes to the people of the United States to be greater than that of making sure that the policy which controls the disposal of surplus war property shall be wise and fully understood by the people of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I believe it to be advisable on my part to make a few remarks in regard to the work of this subcommittee, inasmuch as it was my responsibility not to have appointed it originally, but to have appointed it since the adoption of the Surplus Property Act.

It will be remembered that a long time ago, when the defense program was established, and when the Munitions Control Board was set up, the Senate adopted a provision for the purpose of enabling Congress to be kept informed with reference to what the Munitions Control Board was doing, and to have on the Board the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. In the conference that provision was disagreed to, and a substitute adopted to the effect that the Board should report from time to time to Congress.

When the strategic materials bill became law many persons were frightened at the possible accumulation of stock piles and the storing of supplies, because they believed they might be used by some Government agency in a way which would upset the economy of our country. Popular as the Strategic Materials Act has become, it should be remembered that it was not popular in its early stages; that industry was frightened by it, and that the very persons who are strongly in favor of the act today, and who understand it, opposed the measure when it was originally introduced.

The technique of requiring reports to be made to Congress cannot be as young as some believe it to be, because it has been invoked ever since our Government was founded, and the method of keeping track of the agencies of government whose functions affect the economy of the American people was written into

The committee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. George], which had to do with the postwar economic problems, is not a legislative committee, but it is thinking in exactly the same way that the Congress of the United States thought, namely, that it should be kept informed with reference to what was being done by governmental agencies which might affect the economy of all the people. That is the great broad concept which is involved.

Mr. President, in connection with the two laws which have been mentioned today, namely, the contract settlement law and the surplus property law, there has been placed upon a Senate committee the responsibility of receiving reports from time to time from the agencies which are administering those laws. All those reports have been sent to the Military Affairs Committee. The chairman of that committee has asked each agency to summarize its report, and the report has been put into the RECORD so that all Members of the Senate could follow exactly what was being done. It seemed to the chairman of the committee that if we could, by wise appointment of committee members, bring about a sort of dovetailing of the legislative activities with the activities of the postwar planning group, it would be wise to do so. Originally the committee dealing with contract settlements and with other problems, was composed of only three members. When the Surplus Property Act came into being, the committee was enlarged to five members because it was realized how important its work could be. The chairman of the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee is a member of the George committee. In that way there is constantly in the minds of all concerned the economic condition of all the people.

Now, a word or two with reference to surplus property. Contract settlements have been progressing to the satisfaction of Congress, the administrators, and industry generally. Progress has been satisfactory primarily because every person who takes part in the negotiation of a contract settlement realizes that it is a public affair, and that something will be said to the Congress about what is being done. So far so good.

Then came the Surplus Property Act. Mr. President, there were lengthy hearings held on the original surplus property bill. In one of those hearings a question was asked about how surplus property would be distributed. Such property belongs to the people of the United States. It represents such a great quantity that if it were suddenly dumped on the market it would result in upsetting practically every going con-The commitcern in the United States. tee was told that it would be the objective of the Administrator of Surplus Property to convert the surplus property into cash as soon as possible and liquidate it. Mr. President, that property was estimated to amount to approximately \$100,000,000,000 in value. It consists of nearly everything imaginable. Some persons believe that practically all the articles embraced in the term "surplus property" are worth while in the economy of our country. For example, there is land, in connection with which veterans preferences must be considered. An attempt will be made to reintegrate veterans into civilian life. There are great plants which have been established primarily for war purposes. I am thinking now of one plant, for example, which was built for one single purpose, namely, to manufacture one type of airplane which was to be used in wartime. A great amount of money was spent on the plant, but the purposes for which the plant was constructed have already been fulfilled, and the plant is to be liquidated.

There are other kinds of plants the operation of which affects the basic economy of our country, and which involves the use of strategic materials, so that in case of an attack we can carry on under the theory of—to use a military term—defense in depth. It was realized that in case of an invasion of the United States our industries had not been developed in a strategic way, but had been developed basically with the understanding that they would be peacetime plants quite as well as wartime plants.

The point I desire to make is that each plant probably presents a different problem and each type of surplus property present a different problem. There will have to be a board set up, as a board has been set up, to handle these affairs from day to day, but the responsibility to see that they are administered properly rests with the Congress of the United States and the reports have been made to our committee.

Mr. President, it has been said that the Surplus Property Act was not a particularly good act. The conference committee consisting of members of the Military Affairs Committee and members of the House committee which had charge of the matter-it was not the Military Affairs Committee, if I may correct the Senator from Wyoming-worked not for 1 week, not for 2 weeks, but for several weeks. All the time basically in our minds was the thought that this property belonged to the people of the United States and was to be disposed of in such a way that it would be helpful to the eople of the United States and not ruin them. We all took our work seriously, Mr. President, and we felt that we had done a pretty good job.

Now I wish to emphasize the point that if this subcommittee of the Military

Affairs Committee, which is now one of the strongest subcommittees of the Military Affairs Committee, thinks of its job as one of trying to hinder the proper transfer of this property, of course it is carrying on its work in the wrong way, and the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee would want to correct that, and would put the matter up to the whole committee to see that it was corrected. If it is not the sense of the Senate of the United States that a standing committee should keep track of-I will put it in that way rather than to say supervise or investigate-and be informed so that when a question is asked, what about this and what about that, someone with the background and knowledge may answer, that is one thing.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the statement fust made by the able Senator from Utah is exceedingly constructive. It is well that we have now a clear understanding of what the committee expects to do. It is my belief that those who are going to sell and those who are going to buy surplus property will shun negotiation if there is a continuous investigation. I believe the committee should do just exactly what the Senator says, that is supervise and not intimidate and investigate and interrogate constantly. Both the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Wyoming have told the Senate and the country that this is not going to be an inquisitorial group, but rather an approach from the standpoint of aiding the Government agencies and aiding the industries in order that the taxpayers of America may get the most out of the salvage which may be possible. This is the kind of cooperation which will bring results.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. To show what happened after the last war, I might mention that practically every person who had to do with the retail sale of blankets in the United States at that time was put out of business. He could not sell blankets. Why? Because the Army and Navy dumped blankets onto the market. Stores which were called Army and Navy Stores, or some name of that kind, grew up in every part of the United States. Sheets needed by hospitals were disposed of to such stores. It was extremely hard for a school to get an airplane engine which had become obsolete, so far as its use in an airplane was concerned, in order that the school might use it for study in its automotive engineering course and courses of that kind.

All these things are in the minds of the committee today. We do not want business hurt; we want it helped. I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee knows that during the next few years the problems facing the country will be greater than they have been during the period of mobilization for war. activity is simple compared with getting back to peace activity, and our country will be wrecked if we are not careful.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, and I so reported to the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The committee gets all the reports. It receives verbal reports and presents written reports to the Senate.

I wish to emphasize again that in the disposal, for instance, of plants we have a special injunction put upon us, and Congress is going to know about such things, regardless of how they may be disposed of. If there is conflict in administration I do not know of any other way it can be straightened out.

In an investigation the other day it was not certain whether the Defense Plant Corporation could do certain things without consulting the Surplus Property Board. In my opinion it is clear; I know what to do; and it seems to me that the place to come to get a sanction, so to speak, for some action is to a committee of Congress, a committee that is more or less informed.

Mr. President, those are the idealistic considerations for the continuation of this subcommittee. If the subcommittee should get out of rein, if it should propose something which would interfere, then, of course, it should be stricken down. That is contrary, however, to what is in the minds of the Military Affairs Committee. If it cannot be helpful to the Government, if it cannot be helpful to the people, no one wants a committee of that kind, and no one would accuse the chairman or a Member of the Senate of the United States with having any idea of that kind. Above all, this committee should not take sides in regard to the disposal of property.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. One more point, and I shall be glad to yield. There are also the requirements of the law which bring into the picture another great institution of government, and that is the Department of Justice. Those are the types of things which make it necessary for us to have a clearinghouse here. I am glad now to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the comment of the Senator from Utah about the course that should be followed by the committee prompts me to ask him if, while he has been chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and the present chairman of the subcommittee has occupied that position, the subcommittee has said or done anything which in his judgment could be interpreted as hindering or obstructing either the executive power or industry.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I know of nothing of that kind having been done by the subcommittee, but all sorts of statements have been made about the subcommittee as, of course, they are made about all of us at all times. Questions are raised which are antagonistic instead of constructive, destructive instead of constructive; and then, of course. we all know that there are editorial writings-I do not refer to the press-editorial thinking and, above all, editorial gossip about what should be done. I think that the necessity of constructive action and the need of keeping these committees

properly functioning outweigh any criticism which may be made.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I am rather reluctant to speak on this matter, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Thomas] both made such eloquent and persuasive pleas for the adoption of Senate Resolution 129.

We are told that there is not to be an investigation; that there is not to be an inquisition: that the committee is to be a supervisory committee. But one word stands out very significantly in the text of the resolution as to what the committee is going to do, and the word that is used, notwithstanding the rather angelic promises made by the sponsors of the committee, is the word "investigation."

Mr. President, as has been stated this afternoon time and again, the Congress of the United States passed a surplus property disposal bill, and in that bill the Congress outlined the procedure which the administrative and executive department of the Government should follow in disposing of what is proclaimed to be surplus property. Even before the Surplus Property Board got under way, before they had ever taken a step in the work of following the directions of the Congress as contained in the legislation, they were haled before this committee.

Mr. President, I attended a session of the committee. I do not know whether it was the first one or not, but it was one of the early sessions held this year. Members of the Surplus Property Board were present, and an expert who had been employed by the Board to go into the steel plants which had been erected for war purposes was present. Regardless of what has been said here today, those present were given to understand, if I could comprehend the attitude of the committee, that the committee was going to have a great deal to do with even preliminary negotiations for the disposal of surplus property.

It has been stated here this afternoon time and again by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Utah, that these plants belong to the people of the United States. They do belong to the people of the United States, and the people of the United States are interested in their disposal, and the Congress of the United States, representing those people to whom reference has been made many times this afternoon, has already outlined the policy. We have given the directives by legislation to the Surplus Property Board, and to other Government agencies, as to how they shall proceed in the disposal of this property.

It was stated here by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, I think, that the report called for in the surplus property legislation has not yet been filed. It has not been filed, and in my opinion one of the principle reasons why it has not been filed is the activity of this committee already taken, and I say that advisedly. I know that the very fact that this committee is created, the very fact that it has already begun its activities, is hampering, is impeding he disposal of

surplus war plants and other surplus property

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I heard the Senator make reference to steel plants. If I recall correctly, the Defense Plant Corporation constructed a large steel plant in the Senator's State, and I have heard that such high freight rates were established from that steel plant to the places where the steel might be used as to make the plant itself impracticable under the present freight rates. Can the Senator tell us anything about that, whether it is a fact or not, that almost exorbitant freight rates are charged on the products of this steel plant?

Mr. MURDOCK. I would not say they are exorbitant, but they are too high. They should be reduced, and the Congress of the United States should see that they are reduced, so that a great industrial plant out there, a great industrial unit, around which the entire heavy industry of the Pacific coast can be built and function in the postwar period, is disposed of while it is a going concern, and that it is disposed of under the legislation we have written on the statute

books of this country.

Mr. AIKEN. Is my understanding correct that unless the freight rates were reduced the plant would have difficulty in competing with plants owned by companies in the eastern section of the

Mr. MURDOCK. I think that without any question the freight rates must be reduced. I do not mean by that that the plant cannot compete even under present freight rates, but it is my opinion that fairness and equity in freight rates demand that there be a reduction, a reduction to make the rates consistent with the freight rates throughout the entire county, so that the plan, so far as freight rates are concerned, will be placed on a competitive basis with eastern plants.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know why such high freight rates were fixed on the products of that plant?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not think the freight rates have been specifically imposed on the products of this plant, I believe they were the rates which have prevailed over a long period of time; but I am satisfied that the railroads will eventually put the rates on an equitable basis with other rates throughout the country.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to submit a parliamentary inquiry. I understand the Senators are discussing Senate resolution 129.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. It is my understanding that that resolution was reported only this morning, and in the ordinary course, under the rules of the Senate, it would go over. How does it come before the Senate at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is before the Senate by unanimous consent. Mr. WHITE. Was unanimous consent asked and given?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not as to this particular resolution.

Mr. WHITE. That is what I want to

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There were five or six resolutions presented. and the others were adopted without objection. I think the Chair ruled that this would be open to objection.

Mr. WHITE. Was unanimous consent given for the present consideration

of Senate resolution 129?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not as to this particular resolution. Therefore it would be open to objection.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to know what has become of the appropriation bill that is supposed to be before the Senate? Has that been laid aside?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was not. The Chair will state what happened with reference to it. The Senator from Mississippi had the floor, and he vielded to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] for the specific purpose of reporting some resolutions, with the understanding that he would not lose the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think it is so important that we should continue to work upon and reach a conclusion with respect to the pending appropriation measure that I shall object to any unanimous-consent request for consideration of other matters. I object to the consideration of the resolution at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the Senator's objection, the resolution

will go to the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I trust that no objection will be made now which will take my colleague off the floor.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, have no objection to being taken off the floor. I think it is highly important that the Senate continue with the appropriation bill now before it, instead of being detoured into consideration of an appropriation for a special committee to conduct a special investigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, The resolution will go to the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 937. An act to amend the act suspending until June 30, 1945, the running of the statute of limitations applicable to violations of the antitrust laws, so as to continue such suspension until June 30, 1946; and

S. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to transfer to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the functions, powers, duties, and records of certain corporations.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLU-TIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 937. An act to amend the act suspending until June 30, 1945, the running of the statute of limitations applicable to violations of the antitrust laws, so as to continue such suspension until June 30, 1946;

H. R. 3035. An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other pur-

poses; and

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

WAR AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3368) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Bileo]

has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? Mr. BILBO. For what purposes, may ask?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, without taking the Senator from Mississippi from the floor, and without interfering in any way with his present status, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3550 making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator state again the nature of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is the bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment, and if it is not passed by Saturday night there will be no money at all to support the military.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the military appro-

priation bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes. Mr. WHITE. I shall not object.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Unless the bill is passed by midnight Saturday, Mr. President, there will not be a penny to support the armed forces throughout the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator

from Oklahoma?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, unless the bill we are now considering is passed by the same date, there will not be a penny for the many war agencies provided for in House bill 3368. I object for the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objec-

tion is made.

The Senator from Mississippi has the

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President I am sorry but not surprised because the Senator who objected to the request just made is planning to defeat a measure providing for 16 other agencies and why not 1 more. So I am not surprised.

Mr. President yesterday evening when the Senate recessed the Senator from New Mexico and I were sent away with the injunction from our beloved friend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Mc-KELLAR] to pray-to pray that the Lord might direct us in some way to extricate ourselves from the present complications which confront us. I do not know what my friend the Senator from New Mexico did, but I did pray. The only response I had or have is that still small voice that seems to say to me, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant. Go on and do not weary in well-doing." Therefore, I shall proceed.

I call the attention of Senators to a statement made by the National Economic Council of New York City telling us what is behind this bill:

The past year or two a wave of propaganda has demanded the enactment by Congress and the several States of so-called antidiscrimination laws.

The assumption of many persons is that these measures are a generous and timely effort that will bring contentment to all the people. But there is impressive evidence that they are, instead, merely one more attempt of the Communists to stir up trouble.

I told the Senate yesterday where this movement originated. It came from the brain of A. Philip Randolph, and Eugene Davidson, and Mayor LaGuardia, and Aubrey Williams, and it is well known what influences that crowd has been operating under.

There undoubtedly is some discrimination against many Negroes—

That, Mr. President, has been happening for 300 years, and I am wondering if those behind this movement think they are going to stop it overnight with the enactment of the kind of legislation they propose.

There is no one in the Senate who sympathizes with the Negroes more than I do. I know that for 300 years, since they have been on the American soil, they have been discriminated against. were discriminated against sorely before Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, and since then they have been discriminated against, and they will be discriminated against for the next 500 years or 1,000 years, if permitted to live or if they decide to continue to live side by side with the white men in this country. There is only one way that the Negro can escape this discrimination, and that is by voluntarily returning to his fatherland, west Africa.

Oh, but it is said that this move is in the interest of the war effort. I have a petition signed by a number of Negroes from the South, as well as by a few quisling whites. They say that this legislation is necessary for the war effort. Why? How does it affect the war effort? Mr. Ross, the head of the organization, admits that he has no power. He admits that his 115 employees are just a bunch of happy sugar boys going out over the country dishing out lollypops. They cannot do any good. They have not done any good. They have done nothing but stir up friction, and they have been re-

sponsible for some of the worst strikes we have had in the country. I know of some of the disturbances they have brought about in the South, and I shall read about them to the Senate later. Instead of helping the war effort they have injured the war effort.

It is said that the enactment of the proposed legislation will give us more labor to manufacture more machinery, munitions, and tools of death. Mr. President, there has been no shortage anywhere of labor to carry on except recently we had a shortage of shipbuilders on the Pacific coast, and that was brought about by reason of the idea that was entertained prematurely that the war was about over, and a number of workers went back to their old jobs to obtain employment which was more or less permanent. But even that situation has been resolved.

Today in Detroit and in Chicago strikes are in progress. There is an abundance of labor. There is no shortage of labor in any of the essential industries of the country engaged in making the materials necessary to complete the job in which we are engaged in the South Pacific and in Japan.

There is undoubtedly some discrimination against many Negroes and to a certain extent against many Jews.

That is natural, that is true, and it will continue to be true on and on, regardless of any fool communistic concept of legislation such as the FEPC.

But such discrimination is in large part merely the expression by the 117,000,000 non-Negroes and non-Jews of their choice of employees or fellow employees, or companions or associates. Such choice is, in the very nature of things, a part of liberty itself.

Let me read that again:

But such discrimination is in large part merely the expression by the 117,000,000 non-Negroes and non-Jews of their choice of employees or fellow employees, or companions or associates. Such choice is, in the very nature of things, a part of liberty itself.

Is any Member of this body so foolish as to think that we can legislate and control the tastes, appetites, wishes, and preferences of the people? It is a fool proposition. Under the terms of the bill sponsored in the House by Mrs. Norton, the powers are so far reaching that if the bill were passed, enforcement agents would come up to Capitol Hill and make the rounds of the Senate Office Building. They might come into some Senator's office and say, "You are violating the antidiscrimination law. You have no one employed in your office except white persons. You are discriminating against Negroes. You do not employ any Jews. You are discriminating against Jews. You had better get a colored girl for a stenographer, and you had better slip in a few Jews, too, or you will suffer the pains and penalties of the law, even if you are a Senator." Senators are supposed to obey the laws they make.

You may pass this fool law if you so desire, and you may attempt such an enforcement as I have outlined; but if such enforcement is undertaken, I do not be-

lieve there will be found to be as many law-abiding Senators as one might think.

Negroes and Jews in the United States have had greater opportunities than in any other country on earth.

Let that sink in.

Negroes and Jews in the United States have had greater opportunities than in any other country on earth. On the day the New York legislative committees held a hearing on an antidiscrimination bill the New York papers carried long articles telling of the election of a Negro as president of the Bar Association of Dutchess County, N. Y., and mentioning incidentally that his daughter is a justice of the domestic relations court in New York City.

Since I have been a Member of the Senate we have confirmed the nominations of many members of the Federal judiciary who were Negroes; yet we talk about discrimination. They are receiving great consideration in this country.

But that is not what this measure is intended to do. It is not intended to do away with discrimination. It is a smooth deliberate plan and scheme to integrate the Negro race into the life of the American laboring world. It is one step in the great drive for social equality, social commingling, social intermingling, intermarriage—interbreeding, if you please.

It is said that there is a noted Negro church in this city in which no Negro is welcome as a member of that flock if he is coal-black. He must be a "high brown" to be welcome as a member. That shows the dream and the scheme behind it all.

Increasing numbers of Negroes are constantly attaining distinction in many fields. There is less reason now for antidiscrimination laws than there might have been 10, 20, or 30 years ago.

I wonder why somebody did not think about this damn-fool law in the First World War. The Communists had not yet obtained control of this country. Their influence was not strong during the other war, and no one thought about it.

The situation has been steadily improving in that slow but sure way which is the soundest way of all, but which apparently annoys the zealots and fanatics who wish to see any situation they think wrong righted overnight.

As I told the Newspaper Guild the other day in a telegram, if they continue trying to promote these fool communistic concepts and crank ideas through Congress, the American people will become fed up with it, there will be a revolution, and we will liquidate the whole damnable crowd.

And many good citizens, who have lacked opportunity really to study the matter, are today being misled by these very fanatics, and by an alien-minded element with aims and purposes of its own.

It would be interesting to examine the pay rolls of some of the New Deal bureaus, including the FEPC, and determine the genealogy of the employees on the pay roll, and where they come from. We could then understand why it is a

fertile field for such alien ideas and concepts.

Most Americans regret the existence of any discrimination.

I think that is true. I do not like to see the Negro discriminated against. But when I say that I think the Negro ought to be segregated, Judge Hastie, Roy Wilkins, Dr. DuBois, and many of the white quislings say that segregation is discrimination. They lie. It is not. Segregation is a natural law. It is the natural way of doing things. We practice segregation in connection with many things. On the floor of the Senate we segregate Senators. We make the Republicans sit over yonder, and the Democrats over here. Are we discriminating? According to Judge Hastie, Roy Wilkins, Dr. DuBois, and all the intelligentsia Negroes and their newspapers, that is discrimination. Are we discriminating against Republicans, or are the Republicans discriminating against the Democrats? Inasmuch as the Democrats are in the majority and in control, I suppose we are guilty of discrimination, and I apologize to my friends on the opposite side of the aisle for discriminating against them because we have segregated them over on that side. But many Negroes and white quislings go crazy when we say that Negroes shall eat here and whites shall eat there. They call that discrimination. That is not dis-crimination. I want to see the Negroes have the best churches in the country. I want them to have good schools. want them to have good colleges and universities. I want them to have good homes. I like to see them own their own homes and lands. I am glad to see them have their own playgrounds, ball parks, and swimming pools; but I do not want them to be messing around and puddling around in the water in my swimming

Mr. President, there was a great meeting the other day in New York, for the purpose of inaugurating a campaign to compel the admission of Negro players into the major league baseball teamsthe outfit which HAPPY CHANDLER is going to run. I think one of the most disgraceful things that we tolerate in American life is prize fights between Negroes and white men. I do not want to say it publicly, but I will state it as a fact, that when I see a white man go into the ring with a Negro, in a boxing contest, I am for the Negro; I want him to win every time; I want him to knock hell out of the white man. It is purely a question of physical strength, and the Negro has behind him the strength of giants in Africa for 3,000 years, and he is supposed to be strong and stout and able to knock a home run. The white man, through his culture, his education, and his training, has not put so much stress upon the physical side as he has upon the mental and moral side, for the lass 3,900 years.

I now read further from the pamphlet:

True education, patience, and greater emphasis on the Christian quality of charity (that is, good will) will accelerate the improvement in race relations that has long been noted, but to resort to compulsion by

legislation is not the remedy. That will set the clock back—and will probably do worse. The eighteenth amendment proved that.

The eighteenth amendment was the one by which we tried to make the whole darn country sober overnight, by taking whisky away from the people. The thing would not work. Now we have a lot of these so-called liberals and fanatics who think they are going to revolutionize the conceptions and culture and ideals of the American gentile white man which have existed for a thousand years. and they think they will do it overnight by an act of Congress. Why, Mr. President, it is getting so that every alley rat and town rat and field rat-a lot of fanatics-will come to Washington and will say, "Let's introduce a bill in Congress." A lot of them think they have a Supreme Court which will sustain anything they want.

To the Senators who favor the campaign which now is under way, I say, "If you succeed in the campaign you are now making, I will have to meet it. I will have to fight fire with fire, and I will have to have the legislative counsel prepare a bill, which I will introduce, to prohibit the intermarriage of whites and blacks in all the States of the Union."

I think my friend the Senator from New York [Mr. Wagner] and other Senators will vote for it. I have as much right to go to New York and tell the white people there that they should protect the integrity and blood of their race by not permitting intermarriage between the whites and the blacks, rather than to permit the destruction of both races, as they have to come to Mississippi and tell me, "You cannot have a poll tax." What is the difference?

Now they are coming down to Mississippi and are going to tell every man who is employing six or more persons that he must employ some Jews, some Catholics, some Negroes, some Poles, and some Italians. Employers will be told, "You must not discriminate; give them all a break." In other words, they are going to regulate our taste and our smell, if you please; I will put it that way.

I read further from the pamphlet:

We submit herewith an offset copy of a pamphlet published in 1935 by the Workers Library Publishers.

That is the publishing concern of the Communist Party in the United States.

I read further from the pamphlet:

A perusal of this suggests the likelihood that the antidiscrimination campaign for which many good people, including church organizations, have fallen is of wholly allen

origin.

This National Economic Council of

New York insists that the campaign is of alien origin, and I think the council is right about it.

By the way, there is another bill which I wish to introduce in the Congress if we are going to have a wave of fanatical legislation. I do not think Congress has any right to do it, but I think I should introduce the bill. It is along another line. I am not going to let the Negroes and whites marry anywhere in the

United States, under my law. There are

19 States which permit it today. My State has a law prohibiting the intermarriage of members of the white Caucasian race with members of the Mongolian race. We do not propose to mix with the Japs or the Chinese. Yet we have a noted lady going around the country preaching the intermarriage of the Mongolians and the white Caucasians of America—Miss Pearl Buck; all of you have heard of her. That is her idea; she thinks that is one way to straighten out the Chinese question.

The other bill which I am thinking of introducing is a bill to prohibit the education of whites and blacks in the same schools. We do not permit it in the District of Columbia, and there are no States south of the Mason and Dixon's line which permit the mixing of the races in the schoolrooms. Why not pass a national law prohibiting any of the States from doing it? Certainly those who have been trying to cram these ideas down the throats of my people will not object; they will be good sports about it. If they are going to do this to me in Mississippi. then let me walk into their States and tell them that they are not going to send their children to a Negro school; they are not going to mix them; they are not going to seat a sweet little white girl of 10 or 15 years of age on a bench in a schoolroom with a young Negro boy 10 or 15 years old.

Of course, in Philadelphia, they have Negro teachers over white children. At that impressionable, tender age, Mr. President, you understand, the white thildren have Negro teachers standing over them and teaching them. We know how natural it is for the young child to love and admire and worship and make a hero out of the teacher, and when that child goes out into life, we know what its attitude will be; and we know how easy it is to break over the line, socially, with the result of intermarriage and interbreeding.

I read further from the pamphlet:

"The Negroes in a Soviet America," as the reader will see, is a direct incitement by the Communists to bloody revolt against the white people of the United States, urging them to set up a Soviet form of government and affiliate with Soviet Russia. The foreword on page 2 urges social equality as "a minimum desire" of the Negro.

That is urged as a minimum desire. I read further:

On page 35 is the statement "The Negro people can find inspiration in the revolutionary attempts of Gabriel, Denmark Vesey, Nat Turner * * *" etc.; and upon consulting volume XIV of Albert Bushnell Hart's History of the American Nation, it will be found that two at least of these Negroes were the leaders in Negro revolts in which scores of white men, women, and children were mercilessly slaughtered.

I have before me a copy of the Communistic document to which he refers. It will be interesting to read; Senators should read it. Perhaps they would find out something about what they are doing and what they are supporting here.

On page 38 is the statement that "any act of discrimination or of prejudice against a

Negro will become a crime under the revolutionary law?

That is what some would say now. I

Any act of discrimination or of prejudice against a Negro will become a crime under the revolutionary law.

The antidiscrimination bills carry out this

idea precisely.

At the present moment, of course, the Communist technique has changed—it would not aid in securing a continuance of lend-lease or the expected help in Russian reconstruction if so crude a pamphlet were reconstruction if so crude a pamphiet were circulated now. Nevertheless, as David J. Dallin points out in his book, The Real Soviet Russia (published by the Yale University Press, 1945), this current attitude of the Communists is merely a phase from which the Communists will return to their ruthless Communist program when the current need has passed.

In other words, they will not be so bold. The Comintern has been adjourned for the present. Later on, as they move in step by step with their Communist ideas of government, the good old American Constitution about which we have bragged so much, with its Bill of Rights, will be no longer of any consequence. It will not satisfy some of the persons who are trying to change our educational and economical scheme of government by fool concepts of law.

We got along for 150 years, I may say to my good friend from New Mexico, without the FEPC. I think we can can get along without it for a while longer.

I continue reading:

James W. Ford, one of the authors of the pamphlet has been several times the candi-cate of the Communist Party for Vice Presi-"James S. Allen," the other author, is the alias for Sol Auerbach whose activities were a matter of record before the Dies Committee

This special offset edition of "The Negroes in a Soviet America" has been brought out in order that the people may form a true understanding of what is back of the present huliabaloo about race equality.

Mr. President, here is a copy of a document entitled "Antidiscrimination Laws and the FEPC" which was written by James W. Ford and James S. Allen. It was circulated by the Communists all over the United States in 1935. It did more to poison the minds and arouse the viciousness of the southern Negroes than anything else which had taken place within a quarter of a century. It is the origin of the FEPC. It merely represents a difference in approach.

Mr. President, much has been said about compromising this matter. I wish to read what the Southern Watchman of May 26, 1945, says about compromising on a question of this character when principles are involved. I read:

From Washington this week comes the news that efforts in the Senate Education and Labor Committee to work out "some compromise acceptable to southern Senators" on legislation for a permanent FEPC have "all but collapsed."

Is it any wonder?

A compromise by southern Senators on such an issue as this is unthinkable. Either you order employers to hire so many Negroes and so many whites, or you don't. Either you fasten Federal interference on the employer's right to hire whom he pleases, or you don't. Either you compel the industrial admixture of insoluble labor elements, or

you keep them apart. Either you control the Nation's industrial personnel practices by blanket edict from Washington, or you permit local conditions and customs to prevail. There can be no compromise.

The South got its belly full of FEPC medicine, concected during the height of the New Deal by Executive order, back in 1942-

It was 1941-

when the present "temporary" and "emergency" agency by the name was created.

The first Executive order was in 1941. and the other Executive order was in 1942.

I continue reading:

This strife-stirring Commission conducted a notorious inquisition of southern employers in Birmingham's Federal courtroom and, using its own prosecutor to dictate the hiring practices of numerous industries which were forced to take time out from their production of vital war materials to try to maintain satisfactory, untroubled working conditions in their plants.

The proceeding was sensational in Birmingham where an attempt was being made to control the personnel lists of the industries located there.

I continue reading:

Southerners have not forgotten that a Negro member of this FEPC, sitting on the bench at the Alabama institution, declared that "Executive Order 8802 (creating the agency) supersedes the traditions of the South."

In other words, if any Senator wishes to know something about what is being done today in Congress, and wishes to know the details of it, as well as all about the other side of the question in regard to the FEPC, all he needs to do is to go to a newsstand and buy a copy of the Africo-American. Here is a copy of it. It has references to the FEPC scattered all over it. For example, here is one headline: "FEPC filibuster looms." The next headline is, "Byrnes unfit for Secretary of State. Statement on Negro re-veals attitude."

One time when Senator Byrnes was in the Senate he said, "Neither political equality nor social equality is essential to the happiness of a Negro."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may send a resolution to the desk?

Mr. BILBO. I will be delighted to yield providing that I do not lose the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

objection?

Mr. TAFT. I object.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. Can an objection be made to one Senator yielding to another Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is willing to yield temporarily without losing the floor, an objection will lie, if made.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Chair mean that unanimous consent is required?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct

Mr. BILBO. I am very sorry, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana. I should like to accommodate him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BILBO. I do not wish to yield if I am to be taken off the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not wish to take the Senator off the floor.

Mr. BILBO. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana with the understanding that I retain the floor. If any Senator wishes to object, let him speak now.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator from Mississippi yields for any purpose except for being asked a question, I object to him yielding the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Senator's right.

Mr. BILBO. That is the strict application of parliamentary practice, but this morning the question was raised, and there was an understanding at that time that the rule would not be invoked then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard. The Senator from Mississippi will proceed on the pending measure.

Mr. BILBO. That suits me all right. [Laughter.]

You have started your monkey business before the filibuster starts. I am not filibustering; I am merely trying to educate you.

There is a new and more moderate President in office now. The trend toward left-wing reforms against an unwilling public appears to be abating. Mutual trust and cooperation between Congress and the Executive is in the air. The Senate is apparently anxious to avert a prolonged fillbuster—a certain and necessary eventuality if FEPC advocates persist in forcing a show-down.

I want to read that to my friend from Mexico again:

The Senate is apparently anxious to avert a prolonged filibuster-

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President— Mr. BILBO. The article continues—

a certain and necessary eventuality if FEPC advocates persist in forcing a showdown.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President-Mr. BILBO. I have the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know the Senator has the floor, but I do not want him to be confused. If he has any friends from Mexico, I want him to say so. If he refers to me I want him to say "New Mexi-

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHERRY in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BILBO. I thought the Senator was going to ask me a question, but instead of asking a question, it was just an explosion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BILBO. No; I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well. The Senator from Mississippi will proceed in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I insist to the Senator that I am from New Mexico and not from Mexico.

Mr. BILBO. I insist I know just as much about Mexico as I do about New Mexico, and I do not know a darn thing about New Mexico, and the Senator does not know anything about Mississippi.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the
Senator from Mississippi yield to the
Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question

omy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator know where New Mexico is?

Mr. BILBO. I know a little about my country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am satisfied that "little" is correct.

Mr. BILBO. Well, with what Mexico sends over here, I have not much chance to learn much more.

The article continues:

Even Alabama's junior Senator LISTER HILL declares he cannot swallow the permanent FEPC bill. Coming from a legislator who has jumped through the left-wing hoop quite consistently for a long time, his opposition ought to discourage even the most intemperate reformer.

No, the South does not want a permanent FEPC. It doesn't want a "compromise," either. Its deep-seated feeling on this question was well expressed in the resolution of Senator Lawson, of Greensboro, which both branches of Alabama's Legislature adopted unanimously just a few days ago. That resolution roundly denounced FEPC as a disrupter of friendly and normal relationship now prevailing between the races in this State and called upon their Representatives and Senators in the Congress of the United States to bestir themselves and make sure that it and all other such Federal nostrums are kept out of this State.

If the South's Senators do their full duty,

If the South's Senators do their full duty, there will be no such thing as a permanent FEPC. This journal is confident that the line will be firmly held.—Alabama News

Magazine.

Let them record the fact whether the South holds the line or not.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Senate. Senators desiring to converse will please retire to the cloakrooms, and the Chair asks the galleries, please, to cooperate in keeping order. The Senator from Mississippi will now proceed.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I desire to read the resolution referred to in the article I have just read from the Alabama News Magazine. Here is the resolution of State Senator L. J. Lawson, of Greensboro, Ala., on the establishment of a permanent FEPC as passed unanimously by both the House and Senate of Alabama:

Be it resolved by the Senate of Alabama (the house concurring), That it has been the boast of Americans that our form of government permitted local self-government, thereby making it possible for the widely separated sections of our country to live together in peace and harmony by making allowances for local conditions and situations.

That might be the reason why Alabama and Mississippi cannot get together with New Mexico, which is so far away, and where conditions are different, populations are different, and climate and soil are different.

That in Alabama there exist conditions with respect to relationship between the races

which are not general to the country as a whole, as, for instance, that in certain counties of this State the colored population very greatly exceeds in number the white population:

That the experience of this State in Reconstruction times and since has shown that no good can come from changing the normal course of evolution and development of a race by arbitrary legal means, and that such attempts lead only to violence, misunderstanding, and destruction of the normal and happy relationship now prevailing between the races in this State, and which will continue to prevail here if they are left in peace and harmony to work out their mutual problems: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we do now call upon our Representatives and Senators in the Congress of the United States, by every means within their power, to oppose the enactment of such Federal legislation as the so-called permanent fair employment practice law, the welfare of Alabama, in our opinion, demanding that they do so; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the Members of Congress from Alabama.

There is a great sovereign State, through its legislative branch, calling on its representatives in Congress to do everything in their power to oppose the passage of this damnable legislative measure, upon which there could be no compromise.

I desire to read a little article which is interesting, or ought to be, to some people. It is entitled "When 'Liberals' Become Fascists"; and there is such a thing as a liberal becoming a Fascist.

WHEN "LIBERALS" BECOME FASCISTS

One of these days, our American "liberals" will discover that the essence of freedom—the real liberalism—is the right to love whom we please, to hate whom we please, and to say as much publicly, if so inclined. These "liberals" will discover that it is far more difficult to legislate effectively in behalf of love, or against hate, than for the prohibition of alcoholic beverages. When these "liberals" advocate the establishment of an iniquity such as the Fair Employment Practices Committee, they are playing hand in glove with the identical totalitarian ideas which they profess to despise. They are being Fascists, in the meanest sense of the word.

That is rather hard on the sponsors of the FEPC. I will read part of it again to my dear friend:

American "liberals" will discover that the essence of freedom—the real liberalism—is the right to love whom we please, to hate whom we please, and to say as much publicly, if so inclined. These "liberals" will discover that it is far more difficult to legislate effectively in behalf of love, or against hate, than for the prohibition of alcoholic beverages.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. OVERTON. Would there be any objection on the part of the Senator from Mississippi if I were to ask permission to send to the desk and to have printed a resolution which would read as follows:

Resolved, That when the United Nations Charter to maintain international peace and security, signed at San Francisco, Calif., on June 26, 1945, shall be laid before the Senate for ratification, the injunction of secrecy shall be removed, it shall be read a first time, and the Senate shall thereupon proceed to consider the same in open executive session.

The purpose of the resolution would be that the Senate should immediately proceed to consider the Charter and ratify it without amendment or reservation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment.

Mr. OVERTON. That is a question I am asking.

Mr. BILBO. I yield for the asking of a question, but not for the discussion of business, thereby taking me off the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. I am asking if there would be any objection—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi objects to the introduction of a resolution.

Mr. OVERTON. All I am asking is whether there would be any objection on the Senator's part, or on the part of any other Senator on the floor—

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I shall object-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Maine for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I do not yield to anybody if it will take me off the floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHITE. A parliamentary inquiry.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. WHITE. I make the point of order that if the Senator from Mississippi yields for sending to the desk, for the reading, for the reporting of a resolution, or the consideration of a resolution, or any action whatsoever with respect to a resolution, the Senator from Mississippi will have forfeited his right to the floor.

Mr. BILBO. I did not yield for that purpose, and the Senator is correct in his interpretation of the parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor. He will proceed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question. The Senator merely asked me a question. He may ask another if he desires.

Mr. OVERTON. The question I asked was propounded not only to the Senator from Mississippi—at least it was so intended—but was propounded to all Senators who may be upon the floor, whether there would be any objection to a unanimous consent request that I may send this resolution to the desk to lie on the table.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment. What is the answer of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BILBO. I object to the Senator from Louisiana asking anyone else a question but myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is sustained, and the Senajor

from Mississippi will proceed on the pending matter.

Mr. BILBO. That is a strict construction of the parliamentary law, and we will stand by it. If my friends on the other side wish to become technical, we will conduct our lives accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi will proceed on the pending measure.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I wish to read a statement by a Representative from North Carolina, which has been answered by the publication which I hold in my hand. This is the answer to the question, The White Man's Role.

THE WHITE MAN'S ROLE

Representative Envin. of North Carolina. in his speech to the House last week, oppos-ing the establishment of the FEPC on a permanent basis, pointed out that while the Negro population of America is less than 9.8 percent of the whole, the last quarterly inquiry of the FEPC shows that the Negro personnel in all of the departments and agencies of our Federal Government constitutes 19.2 percent of all the Federal departmental employees, while the Negro personnel in departmental and field work constitutes 11.9 percent of the total civilian employment of our Federal Government.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield. Mr. LANGER. That includes most of the charwomen, does it not, who do all the heavy work?

Mr. BILBO. It does not. Mr. LANGER. How many of them are there in the departments?

Mr. BILBO. If the Senator will go to any of the Government departments today and walk through the large halls which the girl stenographers are using, he will find it looks like a black cloud arising.

Mr. LANGER. All the charwomen are Negroes.

Mr. BILBO. Some of the charwomen are Negroes, but some of them are white. We have had some white women working around in the Capitol. We have some porters who are white. We have some messengers who are white. But I say that in all the departments of the Government, under the New Deal down town, the Senator will find that 19.2 percent are Negroes, although they are not entitled, under this rule of discrimination, to more than 9.9 percent in employment. In other words, they have already twice as many on the job as they are entitled to, according to the pro rata of the population in the United States. Yet, they come around here bellyaching about the situation. I read further:

There are no statistics available on this score, but we do know that, by education and ability, there are far more white people capable of holding down these Federal jobs than there are Negroes, on a percentage basis. Considered on the basis, the advantage of the Negroes, already better than two to one, takes even greater proportions.

When will some southern Congressman introduce a bill guaranteeing to the white people of this country, and especially to those of the South, equality in treatment by the Federal Government? That is the real, crying need of today in the field of fair employ-

ment practices.

I am wondering if my friend from North Dakota catches the point. Some one should introduce a bill making it obligatory on the Federal Government to see to it that these minorities which are raising so much hell are permitted to get only their pro rata share of the Federal jobs. If that were done, it would be necessary at once to dismiss half the Negroes who are on the pay roll, because they have more than half of the number to which they are entitled. That would open the way for several thousand white girls and white boys to get these good, fat Government jobs in Washington. If the desire is to do away with discrimination in this country, let us have another bill to go along as a companion to the pending bill, and we will straighten the thing out. But some do not want to straighten it out. They like for it to be crooked.

Here is a message to the southern Members of the United States Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of calling a quorum?

Mr. BILBO. I refuse to yield for the call of a quorum because it would take me off the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is correct. He may proceed.

Mr. BILBO. I read:

We support you to the hilt in the plans which we presume you are already making to filibuster as long as it takes to defeat the antisouthern bill to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee. understand why no compromise on this radical proposal was possible in the Education and Labor Committee. Even the Senator from Florida, Mr. Pepper, a consistent supporter of the old Roosevelt left-of-center movement, could not stomach this one. The 12 to 5 vote in committee to report it favorably was a geographical vote. The FEPC bill is an intolerable assault upon the South's patient, practical, increasingly treatment of its racial problem. successful

The advocates of this legislation are reformer-agitators from other areas who face no such concerns as we do. This bill represents dictation-from-afar at its worst. It is discriminatory, because no other section would suffer as would the South. It is dangerous, because it courts violence.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question. Mr. LUCAS. How long does the Senator expect to speak?

Mr. BILBO. How long do I expect to speak?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.
Mr. BILBO. Until the FEPC is dead. Mr. LUCAS. I am glad I understand the Senator.

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

The hard-handed sponsors of this evil scheme to force whites and Negroes to consort, regardless of sex, regardless of local custom, regardless of segregation laws, regardless of everything but the furious fiirting with the northern Negro vote-these meddlers have had ample notice of your deter-mination that this shall not come to pass.

They know they are faced with a filibuster. They have asked for it. Let them have it.

We are getting ready to do that very thing.

You will be criticized by pinkish pundits for holding up the wheels of lawmaking while

we are at war. Let that not deter you. You didn't start this fight. But we are depending upon you to be in at its finish.

Southern Senators, organize your ranks for this vital show-down. The South is squarely behind you. You know all too well that this is one thing we won't take .-Alabama News Magazine.

That statement from an Alabama newspaper states the case exactly. We are here face to face this afternoon with two bills on the calendar which ought to be passed. One contains an appropriation of \$38,000,000,000 for the war. After next Monday the Army will have no money unless the bill is passed. We also have the other bill which is now under consideration, known as the war agencies bill, which provides \$777,000,000 to support 16 war agencies. Unless the bill is passed this week, next Monday they will not have a cent to spend. That bill came from the House without any FEPC in it. There was not a line in it concerning FEPC. There was not a suggestion in it about FEPC. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and was reported by that committee and placed on the Senate Calendar and it is now here before us ready for passage without containing one word about FEPC, without having in it 1 cent for FEPC.

What happened, Mr. President? My good friend, the Senator from New Mexico, who has been very active since last year in this campaign-and I have before me a copy of the hearings before the subcommittee of which he was chairman-makes public announcement that he is going to make a motion to suspend the rule of the Senate in order to put into the bill which heretofore has been clean, which heretofore has had nothing to do with FEPC, which has not been tainted, which has not been touched. which is ready to be passed in 3 minutes-he insists on suspending the rule and putting in this bill this piece of poison, knowing that when he does so it will kill the bill. Not only that, Mr. President, it will result in killing all the other bills on the calendar.

I reason this way about the matter. Insistence on the motion to suspend the rule, which requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate, in order to put this damnable communistic appropriation in the bill, will result in killing the bill, for we will maintain a filibuster against it until midnight Saturday. Therefore, the Senator who makes the motion and Senators who vote to suspend the rule are responsible for the death of the bill. That is the reason I am speaking now before the

filibuster starts. [Laughter.] Mr. President, I am trying to show the Senate that the FEPC is a damnable thing, that it is an unrighteous thing, that it is an unholy thing, that it is a trouble-breeding thing, that it will bring about confusion, trouble, and even bloodshed in the Nation, especially in the South. I am trying to get that over, to get that into the minds of Senators and to let them know that we cannot stand for it and we will not stand for it. We cannot even compromise on the matter.

Mr. President, I beg Senators, I plead with them not to make such a motion. I have been trying to show them why, in the interest of our Government, they should not do it. I have been trying to show that they should not make it because it will defeat the bills which are on the calendar. Senators cannot justifiably say that we who oppose FEPC are responsible if the bills are defeated, that the filibuster has killed them, because we put other Senators on notice, and we present the Senate with a clean bill which has passed through the House, which has been reported by the Appropriations Committee and is in the Senate now ready to be passed. But other Senators try to stop the bill on its way and fill it full of poison.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the

Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question. Mr. LANGER. No, I have no question. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi may proceed.

Mr. BILBO. That proves that a Senator can change his mind, and I hope

other Senators will.

I have before me a copy of the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor on Senate bill 2048. I want Senators to listen to this. I read from page 122:

Statement of Prof. James H. Sheldon, chairman, New York Metropolitan Council on Fair Employment Practice, New York, N. Y.

That council is composed of the following:

New York Urban League. That is

Negro.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. That is Negro.
Constant New York CO. Constant

Greater New York CIO Council. That is either Negro or mixed.

New York Council of Church Women,

Ah, that is Negro.

Loyal Americans of German Descent. That is hybrid.

City-wide Citizens Committee for Harlem. That comes from a black section. I guess it is colored too.

Federation Employment Service. I do not know what that is.

Brotherhood of Painters. I do not know what that is.

Common Council for American Unity. That sounds communistic.

Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League. That is communistic too.

Brother Toombet all way Carmen of

America. I cannot say what that is.

Joint Council of Dining Car Employees
of New York. I know that is black.

The YMCA, various branches; YWCA, various branches, and so on.

National Council of Jewish Women, and many other similar well-established and responsible institutions.

Those are the members of the council for whom Professor Sheldon speaks. I will not bore the Senate by reading all the testimony, but will read one sentence; that will be sufficient:

The passing of this kind of law is just as important as signing a peace treaty. We have not won the war as long as there is a residue of Hitlerism, conscious or unconscious, operating in the minds of the men who run the employment offices of American industry. We might as well face the facts now that although Hitler is clearly losing the war—

He lost it since-

and losing it badly, he has nevertheless, won a certain phase of it, to the extent that he has succeeded in leaving many of the worst doctrines of Mein Kampf scattered about the minds of millions of thoughtless Americans. Democracy in this country—

Listen, Senators-

will not be safe until we have adopted the necessary devices to get rid of this last loathsome evidence of the nazism, and a permanent FEPC is one of the very first medicines to be prescribed for this purpose.

Mr. President, Professor Sheldon is a wise old boy. He knows what it is all about. He knows what he is doing. He knows the scheme behind FEPC.

He dares to come before the committee and say "This is the first dose we are going to give you. We have other doses waiting for you when you swallow this one," to get rid of what he considers anti-Communists. It can be seen, from the bunch he represents, what his sentiments are.

I have before me a copy of the CIO News of June 25, 1945.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question. Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the Senator from Mississippi ever hear of a Catholic Communist?

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does he consider Monsignor Ryan, of the Catholic Church, a Communist?

Mr. BILBO. I do not know the gentleman.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish the Senator would read what he says about the FEPC, from the pamphlet which the Senator has just been reading.

Mr. BILBO. I do not know him, but I do know that there are a few Catholic priests in this country who, along with some Jewish rabbis, are trying to line up with the Negroes in teaching social equality.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would the Senator be willing to submit to the Senate the names of the priests to whom he refers?

Mr. BILBO. I will make a list of them and let the Senator have it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish the Senator would do so.

Mr. BILBO. I believe I have some of the names here, on a petition from Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator may have the names on a petition, but that does not prove that they are Communists. The Senator said they were Communists.

Mr. BILBO. No; I did not say they were Communists. I said they were trying to bring about social equality with the Negro race. Some Baptist preachers, as well as some Methodist preachers, are doing the same thing. I am not reflecting on the Catholics. Some of my best friends are Catholics. I admire them greatly. Down in my home State

there is a Catholic priest of whom I am very fond. I send him a birthday present every year. He is my "pal."

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sure he appre-

ciates it.

Mr. BILBO. But that does not do away with the fact that some of them are rotten, just as some Baptists and some Methodists are rotten. There is something wrong in every organization. I read from the CIO News of June 25,

1045

Eighty-one percent of discrimination cases were against Negroes, Ross found, 9 percent against Jews, and 10 percent against foreignborn, mostly Mexicans.

Private industry was responsible for 69.4 percent of the cases; Government agencies, 24.5 percent, and labor unions, 6.1 percent. These labor unions, incidentally, are AFL since the CIO does not permit discrimination.

In other words, the American Federation of Labor is against this measure. That is one of the great labor organizations of the Nation. But the CIO, another great labor organization, is for it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.
Mr. CHAVEZ. Has the Senator looked at the statement in the hearings from which he was reading, showing the position of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. BILBO. Oh, yes. There are some traitors in the American Federation of Labor; but I am talking about the great body of the American Federation of Labor. They are opposed to this kind of Communist-concept legislation. The CIO is for it. It was the CIO in Washington which staged a famous dance, where Negroes were invited to come and dance with the white daughters of CIO members. So I am not surprised to find the CIO lined up in support of this kind of fool legislation.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of submitting an amendment to the Chavez amendment?

Mr. BILBO. That would take me off the floor. I decline to yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I certainly would not want to take the Senator off the floor.

Mr. BILBO. There will be time for the Senator to offer his amendment when the Senator from New Mexico makes his motion to suspend the rule, and while we are discussing that motion. I think that would be the proper time for the Senator to offer his amendment.

Let us see what my old friend, Westbrook Pegler, says about the FEPC. He is a pretty good authority. I do not always agree with him, but as a rule he is right. This is hot off the bat:

New York, June 25.—As soon as I can get around to put the bite on John Hartford, the president of the Atlantic & Pacific grocery chain, for a couple of hundred thousand dolars, I am going to start in business with a wonderful idea I had just this very minute. I feel pretty confident that Mr. Hartford will let me have the money because, to me, the idea seems a much better proposition than Elliott Roosevelt's radio thing. And if John figured that Elliott was handicapped in a

business way because his old gent was President of the United States, then his heart ought to bleed for me because my pop is a game warden by trade. You know how everybody hates those guys who come around with a caliper and measure a bass fish that you have just caught by the face and it is a sixteenth of an inch short.

And before you can even throw it back he nabs you, and the judge—he makes a bum of you by saying it is louses like you who make it so nobody can snag a perch or knock off a duck any more, and him with a whole cooler full of illegal fish and birds that the warden grabbed from a lot of poor innocent saps like you for under-size or out-of-season or last year's license and all this and that, and divvied with the honorable court.

divvied with the honorable court.

Well, like I say, this is a wonderful idea of mine because I have been looking into this antidiscrimination thing—

That is, the FEPC-

where they want a Federal law so if you are running a business—say like a hotel and you want to hire a room clerk and naturally you want one of those good-looking personality types but the first guy to hit you for the job is the oneriest bum you ever laid eyes on and he chews tobacco and picks his teeth with a nail file and he starts off by insulting you, just for a sample of how he is going to treat the guests.

So, of course, you give him the brush and you are just about to interview some nicelooking, well-mannered guy who is reeking with class when the slob that you have just turned down hollers:

"Wait a minute, you dirty rat, because if you don't give me the job I am going to get the antidiscrimination board after you—

That is, the FEPC-

and we will slap you in the booby for about a year and a day and it will cost you \$10,000 even, because I am one of those downtrodden minority muggs and it is against the law to discriminate against me on account of my race, color, religious belief, or country of origin."

"I don't give a damn about your race, color, religious belief, or what country you came from, except I would be glad to pay your way back there," you say to the guy, "and I am discriminating against you because you are a knock against the whole human race—and you don't smell any too fresh."

But, nevertheless, your lawyer says, absolutely, you have got to give him the job, so in about 10 days your hotel is a haunted house and the sheriff takes over.

So this is where my wonderful idea begins to operate and I certainly hope Mr. Hartford will appreciate what a handicap it is to have a game warden for your old man because with a couple of hundred thousand I am confident I could make a million and I will give him quite a slab of stock in the concern and if it should fold up, why I will get my old gent to get some friend or his to buy it back for \$4,000 and he can call it a bad debt and he isn't exaggerating when he says bad.

My idea is to get in a big supply of burnt cork, like Lew Dockstader and Honey Boy Evans used to put on their faces for the old-time minstrel shows, and some good dialect comedians like Moran and Mack for the colored sound effects and maybe Peter Mack for the Jewish and Italian dialects and open up a school where a guy by the name of say, like, for instance, Smith or Jones, he can point a minority and get a job.

Here is where business is going to pick

So then if a fellow doesn't happen to belong to any particular minority and his religion is just some ordinary American Sunday-go-to-meeting sect, and he doesn't have any other country of origin except the United States, why then he can stand an even chance with the minorities.

I think we would have to charge about \$100 a semester for the course but we would have examinations at the end and we would have commencement exercises where the graduates would give demonstrations of their training as they stand under the ceremonial arch with a motto in paper flowers reading something like Beyond the Alps Lies Italy, or The Bay Is Crossed; the Ocean Lies Before.

Like, for instance, a fellow who took the colored course, he would stand up there looking like Eddie Cantor and give an imitation of how he would apply for a job as floorwalker in some swell store and he would say, "Ah sho nuff gotta git me dis flo-walkin' job 'cause ifn Ah don' get it, yeah bo', Ah sho am gonna call de law and you-all gonna rest yo'se'i in de can, hot diggity dog. What say, bo'?"

say, bo'?"

The student going out for the Jewish minority would speak about the same piece, excepting he would use Milt Gross' dialect, on which I suppose we might have to pay Milt a little royalty, and lay it on a little thick like this saying, "Oy, gevalt, I vant you should giff me already de job wot I am walking on de floor yat."

I am not so hot on Italian, Polish, Ukrainian, and Macedonian but with all that capital

I am not so hot on Italian, Polish, Ukrainian, and Macedonian but with all that capital we could hire experts from the OWI when the exodus starts and I am going to beat John Hartford over the ears with the argument that the great majority in the United States are going to need this course in order to join the minorities and get a fair break. Handicapped as I am, through my pop, I will just about break John's heart and I am a dead cinch to walk out with the scratch.

Mr. Pegler has a great idea there and a great scheme. He is going to establish this school which will teach gentiles how to ape members of the minorities which some Senators are trying to take care of in the bill, so that gentiles can get jobs, because, as the law is written, they cannot get jobs. When there is a vacancy, the industrialist or the businessman who does not want to become enmeshed in the toils of the law is afraid to give the job to a white man or to a gentile, I should say, because a Negro or a Jew would come around and would say to him, "You should have given me that job. I want the job, and I am qualified. I have been discriminated against, and I will report you," and then he will start the wheels of the machinery of Government moving, and the poor industrialist will be fined, his business will be hurt, his time will be lost, and hell will break loose generally.

So it is a great scheme. Of course, Pegler is trying to be funny; but it is a great scheme, when the 125,000,000 of the people of the United States who are gentiles will not have a chance under this law to get jobs. But they can take Pegler's course and can learn how to imitate a Negro or how to imitate a Jew or how to imitate a Pole, and then they can get a job, and after they once get the job they need not conceal their true identity any longer.

Here is an editorial which I should like to read. It is entitled "The FEPC and Hell":

THE FEPC AND HELL

The alphabet has assumed major portions in the pattern of the new order, together with seemingly innocent titles, it has passed much damaging legislation. The FEPC means nothing to the average man unless he takes time out to investigate it; then he will run

into another innocent-sounding name for it, "Fair Employment Practice Commission." Nothing wrong with that. Who doesn't want to be fair? That, of course, is as it was designed, catchy, implying one thing while meaning entirely to the contrary. The only chance we have to find the nigger in the wood pile is to look for him.

There's nothing fair about the bill nor the practice. It was designed with a twofold purpose; to entice the Negro vote, and to appease the Communist elements that are operating within the Nation.

No white gentile American can support the measure with any degree of honor. If the FEPC is made permanent, these United States will then have a mandate for the second revolutionary war.—The Southern Outlook.

There is a lot of sense in that editorial.

Mr. President, last night I received a
letter which I should like to read at this
time. It comes from Kansas City:

JUNE 25, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR BILEO: FEPC is an iniquitous institution, and I am surprised that President Truman favors it. I hope he does not ape Roosevelt.

FEPC is one of the symptoms of national disorder; it is a frontal assault upon the decent social order which has existed in America since it was founded; it menaces the foundations of this Republic; it is the weapon of "red" fascism.

FEPC is part of a movement which threatens gentile white preservation.

I am proud that you have the courage to fight FEPC and resist the tremendous pressure which is being put on legislative representatives.

FEPC is an atrocious evil which assaults the social principles which have made our country great. In fighting it you exhibit the courage which one must have in this terrible time.

God bless you Senator. More power to you. Sincerely.

That is from Kansas City. I wish I had had time to communicate with the writer of the letter, to get his permission to have his name printed in the Record, but unfortunately I have not had time to do so. Therefore, I ask the reporter not to have his name printed.

Here is a letter from good old Mississippi, from one of the leading businessmen in the State:

Howison (Forest Lodge), Miss., June 23, 1945.

Hon. THEODORE G. BU.BO, Senior Senator From Mississippi, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Just noticed in yesterday's press how some Atlanta (Ga.) Baptist preacher lambasted you for your remarks with ref-erence to the class of folks in Atlanta who signed the petition to Congress asking that the Fair Employment Practices Act be made permanent. I am writing you simply to state that I fully concur with you in any adjective you see fit to apply to those signers in Atlanta or to similar signers in any other portion of this Nation, and for the reason that I am unable to see how any sane, sensible white man in this country, either in the South or in the North, can be in favor of such legislation. It is, of course, easy for any man to get signers to any type of petition. It is my belief that if the opponents in Congress to this monstrosity of a measure could get before the American people its real meaning and the demoralizing results that would come from it, the advo-cates would vanish. For the Lord's sake, what in the name of God is this country coming to, anyway. All three of my sons are in the service, but if they are fighting and sacrificing for the type of freedom and type of life as it appears now we are doomed for, then I wish I could call them all home, as I feel they are fighting for a lost cause.

Very sincerely yours,

P. N. HOWELL.

To my mind, this good citizen has the right slant on the whole picture. If we do not put a stop to all these so-called liberal Communist ideas of a republican and democratic form of government, we will be headed for trouble.

Here is another letter from Atlanta, Ga.:

Senator Bileo, of Mississippi,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your very recent statement in a letter to a certain Atlanta clique regarding the FEPC pending legislation, is the whole truth and nothing but the truth and you are to be commended and supported by every true America-loving citizen. The fact is, you did not state the condition existing in Atlanta half strong enough. The truth is, Senator, Atlanta is a hotbed of communistic-minded people in high places. It is permeating the atmosphere of our churches, colleges, and schools, and the Government bureaus are saturated with it. This condition, as you well know, exists in every State, county, city, and village in the United States and if you red-blooded Americans in the Congress let legislation like the FEPC be enacted into the laws of the land, then I say, God pity us as a nation.

Yours truly,

Mr. President, I now read an editorial from the Mobile Register, which is one of the influential papers of the South. The title of the editorial is "Prospective New Move for More FEPC Funds Should Be Defeated." I will read it because the editor has made a very strong argument which should convince any doubting Thomas.

I read:

When the Senate takes up the war agencies appropriation bill this week a fight apparently is going to be made on the floor to add an appropriation for the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee. The Senate will serve the interests of domestic harmony if it defeats the maneuver.

The legislative picture on the FEPC is quite complicated. The agency has never been authorized by Congress but was created by an Executive order of President Roosevelt on June 21, 1941, then recreated by another Executive order of May 23, 1943.

Last year Congress inserted a provision in the independent offices appropriation bill by which no appropriation may be used to pay the expenses of any agency after it has been in existence for more than a year, unless Congress specifically appropriates money for it or has authorized it to expend funds. That means the end of the FEPC after this fiscal year unless Congress puts more money in its hands, which Congress should not do.

In other words, this writer is trying to get over the idea that at midnight next Saturday the FEPC will be dead, and will be ready for interment. I would be very glad to serve as a pallbearer.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question. Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the Senator's status will not be changed, I ask him to yield to me in order that I may move that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill (H. R. 3550), the War Department appropriation bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question. Is the bill to which the Senator from Oklahoma refers the war appropriation bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes. It provides for funds for the military establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the bill contain any items which would be controversial?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There are five or six amendments which were unanimously agreed to by the subcommittee, and by the main committee as well. The bill was reported unanimously to the Senate by the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So far as the pending business is concerned, I have no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3550, making appropriations for the Military Establishment.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3550), making appropriations for the military establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, before the amendments are taken up I desire to submit for the Record a very brief explanation of the bill. In order to save the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As passed by the House of Representatives, H. R. 3550 provides total available funds during the fiscal year 1946 of \$38,500,285,951 for military activities of the War Department. However, unanticipated increases in construction requirements have forced the War Department to request an increase of \$120,618,630 for this purpose and this increase has been approved and incorporated in the Senate bill.

The total amount is made up of two parts. Prior year funds in the sum of \$17,124,002,-551 were reappropriated. This represents the unobligated balance or carry-over, as well as the anticipated recoveries to be made as a result of deobligation of funds after July 1. The sum of \$21,496,902,030 in new money is appropriated, and the total of new money and reappropriated funds is \$38,620,904,581.

For the sake of comparison, I wish to show here the amount of new money and reappropriated funds provided by Congress each year since 1942 and the proposed amounts recommended in the present bill.

Year	New money	Reappro- priated	Total funds
1942 1943 1944 1945 1946	\$75, 462, 593, 587 42, 820, 006, 365 49, 034, 839, 673 15, 434, 814, 795 21, 496, 902, 030	\$32, 109, 556, 877 15, 176, 410, 288 32, 757, 963, 469 17, 124, 002, 551	\$75, 462, 593, 587 74, 929, 563, 242 74, 211, 249, 961 48, 192, 778, 264 38, 620, 904, 581

Not only has there been an over-all decrease in the dollar requirements of the War Department amounting to more than 20 percent, when compared with the current program, but the emphasis has shifted as regards the elements of this program. Formerly the fund requirements for supplies and equipment represented the major part of the War Department program. For 1946 this element is reduced to only 54 percent of the 1945 requirement and, for the first time, purchase of supplies and equipment will represent less than half of the total fund requirements.

On the other hand, funds required for pay and travel of the Army show an increase. This is due to the fact that the planned decrease in strength of the Army from an average of 8,100,000 to 7,700,000 is more than offset by mustering-out payments increased longevity pay and increased travel. It is estimated that 2,067,482 officers and enlisted men will be entitled to mustering-out payments, ranging from \$100 to \$300. The increased travel in the United States is due to the redeployment of our troops.

In general, then, it may be said that those items like pay, subsistence, clothing, etc., which relate directly to the strength of the Army, show minor changes from the current year, while procurement of equipment and supplies, such as planes, tanks, guns, and ammunition, carry drastic reductions. The termination of hostilities in Europe has made it possible to substantially reduce outstanding orders for a wide range of equipment, thereby effecting extensive savings and reductions in obligations.

A further reduction is made possible through completion of the industrial facilities expansion program of the War Department. Production capacity is now adequate to meet present requirements and no additional plants are contemplated, except as required to produce newly developed items for which existing facilities are unsuitable or inadequate.

In considering the plans of the Army for the coming year as they affect fund require-ments, the following points should be points should be ments, the stressed. The paramount aim is the defeat of Japan as quickly as possible. A quick victory will save American lives and is economical of matériel and national war effort. It will also impress the result most forcibly on the Japanese. It is the desire of the War Department to bring back through the United States, with a 30-day furlough home en route, the maximum number of soldiers consistent with this paramount aim of swift and powerful operations in the far Pacific. It is also the desire of the Army to demobilize, under its point system, men who have earned the right to discharge at the maximum rate permitted by redeployment operations. It is estimated that an average discharge rate of 167,000 per month can be attained.

The program contemplated that a division redeployed from Europe to the Pacific will practically dissolve upon reaching the United States east-coast port, whence solid train loads of soldiers will move within 24 hours to distribution points nearest their homes. From there the soldiers go as individuals to their homes, returning after completion of the 30-day leave to the distribution point.

From here, solid trains move to the designated training area where the division is reconstituted, built up to strength with replacements, and trained prior to departure for the Pacific.

Turning to certain specific appropriations, subsistence estimates are based upon the continued supply of about five pounds of food per man per day, and reflect an increased distribution of fresh foods in our theaters of operation. These are shipped frozen and stored in cold storage plants overseas. Estimates for clothing and equipage provide for the supply of woolen clothing in Europe and cotton and woolen clothing in Europe and cotton and woolen clothing in the Pacific. Under an exchange system, recently initiated, a soldier may turn in clothing too damaged or dirty for wear and receive clean, fresh clothing in exchange.

clothing in exchange.

Signal Corps estimates cover development, procurement and maintenance of communications, and meteorological equipment and supplies other than those peculiar to the Army Air Forces. The defeat of Germany is reflected in a decrease of some 38 percent below the current year for supplies and equipment. Construction in connection with the installation of such equipment is off more than 40 percent, but maintenance and operations show a decline of only 10 percent from the current year, due to repackaging requirements for the Pacific war.

The bombing operations against the Japanese Islands are daily news. These operations are being stepped up and, although Japan's industrial targets are spread over an area one-tenth the size of the German target area, it is planned to drop three times as many bombs as were dropped on Germany in any 1 year. Termination of the war in Europe has released thousands of first line aircraft for redeployment against Japan and has enabled the Air Forces to cut back its production schedule by more than 40,000 planes.

Fund requirements of the medical department will remain at about the same level as in the current year. The committee hearings developed the fact that our sick and wounded, in hospitals at home and overseas, are receiving the best of care and medical attention. While every effort is being made to return the maximum number of doctors to civilian life, the Army is unable to reduce such personnel, in proportion to reduction in over-all military personnel, since only the physically well are discharged. The Army is, however, keenly aware of the serious situation in civilian communities and is doing all in its power to help.

all in its power to help.

Under engineer activities, the planned reconditioning and transshipment of engineer equipment to the fullest practicable extent will make it possible to reduce procurement of new equipment and supplies by 40 percent. Construction will continue to be limited to actual war requirements, the new program being reduced to approximately 45 percent of that of the current year. Due to the large redeployment through the United States, there will be some increase for maintenance of barracks and quarters.

The victory in Europe and the full utilization of existing stocks in all inactive theaters for prosecution of the war in the Pacific make it possible to effect a sizable reduction in the program of ordnance service and supplies. On the other hand, our chemical-warfare requirements remain about the same, due to the increased production of incendiary bombs for use against Japan. Stepped up incendiary raids from the air and the increased use of portable and tank-mounted fiame throwers on the ground will characterize our forthcoming operations.

The cessation of hostilities in Europe has permitted a substantial reduction in our lend-lease programs. The total for next year is only 18 percent of the amount appropriated last year for this purpose. Similarly, requirements for civilian relief for the coming

year are only some 50 percent of the current appropriation for this purpose. As stated above, the man-year strength of

As stated above, the man-year strength of the Army for the coming fiscal year is set at a planned figure of 7,700,000. The strength on July 1, 1945, is estimated to be 8,300,000, which will be reduced to 6,968,000 by June 30, 1946.

The total amount appropriated, which consists of new funds and reappropriated prior year funds, is broken down substantially as follows:

Pay and travel	\$13,620,000,000
Subsistence	2, 940, 209, 538
Clothing and equipage	1, 615, 032, 027
Regular supplies	771, 000, 000
	1, 785, 000, 000
	1, 020, 151, 000
Air Forces	5, 779, 798, 188
Medical Department	395, 231, 223
Engineer Service	3, 411, 681, 592
Ordnance Department	5, 731, 450, 000
Chemical Warfare Service	765, 000, 533
Expediting production	86, 780, 000
Special service schools, de-	
partments, and miscella-	
	Subsistence

neous_____

699, 570, 483

Total_____ 38, 620, 904, 581

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, there are only five or six amendments which have been reported by the committee. The first one is with respect to conscientious objectors. The House took the position that conscientious objectors should not be given any consideration whatever, and that no part of the funds provided in the bill should be used to educate them, or to transport them to any place except for the purpose of keeping them in some concentration camp. The position of the Senate committee was that those men should be used wherever they could be efficiently employed. So the committee has stricken from the bill the prohibition which was placed in it by the House. That is one amendment.

Amendment number 2 is known as the Case amendment. At the present time employees who work for the Government in places such as the Panama Canal and Hawaii receive a differential in compensation of 25 percent. The House provided in the bill that no part of the funds could be used to pay that differential. If the provision remains in the bill it will result in conditions such as the following:

The Navy and other agencies could still pay a differential in other countries, but the War Department could not. For that reason the Senate committee recognized that the prohibition should be stricken from the bill.

The third amendment relates to the education of medical students. The House position is that no part of these funds should be used for the education of medical students following a certain period of time. The Senate committee's recommendation is to strike out the provision and permit the War Department to continue the education of medical students to the end that when the war is over, or as soon as possible thereafter, we may have an increased number of doctors in order to attend to the health requirements of the people of our country.

The next amendment is one which came to the committee after the House had acted on the bill. It relates to additional funds for engineers. The engi-

neers of the War Department made a showing before the committee, and justified their request that the bill be amended by adding \$120,000,000. The break-down is shown in the committee report which Members may examine, if they so desire.

The other amendment relates to the percentage of funds which may be transferred from one department to another. Heretofore, under the law, as much as 10 percent could be transferred from one fund to another. The House adopted a provision reducing it to 5 percent. The Senate committee is of opinion that 5 percent is too small, and recommends that the 5-percent limitation be stricken, and that the limitation of 10 percent be restored.

Those were the amendments reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Military Activities-Finance Department-Finance Service, Army," on page 7, line 24, after the word "allotter", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be used for any expense pertaining to (1) the instruction, education. or training of class IV-E conscientious objectors in colleges, (2) the service of such conscientious objectors outside the United States, its Territories and possessions, (3) the transportation of such conscientious objectors to or from any college or any such service, or (4) the compensation of military or civilian personnel performing any services with respect to the matters set forth in (1), (2), or (3) above after the enactment of this act, except any services which may be necessary promptly to terminate any such class IV-E conscientious objector college or foreign-service projects existing on the date of the enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to. The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 12, to strike out:

No part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be available to pay special allowances for foreign service to civil employees of the War Department or members of the armed forces for that service performed in the State, Territory, or island of their legal residence.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps—Quartermaster Service, Army," on page 21, line 22, after the figures "\$200,000,000," to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any expense incident to educating persons in medicine (including vetermary) or dentistry if any expense on account of their education in such subjects was not being defrayed out of appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944 prior to June 7, 1944, except that nothing herein shall interfere with compliance with the provisions of law authorizing the detail

of officers and enlisted men of any component of the Army of the United States as students, observers, and investigators as contemplated by section 127 (a) of the National Defense Act, approved June 3, 1916, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers—Engineer Service, Army," on page 32, line 21, after the word "facilities", to strike out \$37,879,000" and insert "\$158,497,630."

The amendment was agreed to. The next amendment was, on page 34, line 21, after the word "Army", to strike out "\$2.898,582,000" and insert "\$3,019,-200.630."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Printing and binding, War Department," on page 53, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "5" and insert "10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third

The bill (H. R. 3550) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Thomas of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. Russell, Mr. Thomas of Utah, Mr. Gurney, Mr. Brooks, and Mr. Burton, conferees on the part of the Senate.

WAR AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3368) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other pur-

PRESIDING OFFICER. The The

Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me that I may present another resolution to the Senate?

Mr. BILBO. I shall be happy to yield if there is no objection.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. WHITE. May I inquire what the resolution is?

Mr. LUCAS. It is a short resolution, to continue a committee which has been in existence heretofore. I overlooked it a moment ago when I was presenting a number of resolutions to the Senate. It will take but a short time, and if the Senator from Mississippi will yield to me, with the understanding that he shall not forfeit the floor, and I can get unanimous consent, I shall present the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator withhold his request for the time being? I wish to speak to another Senator who has some interest in the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. This resolution is not controversial at all.

Mr. WHITE. So far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection, but if the Senator will withhold the request-

Mr. LUCAS. I withdraw my request.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. BILBO. For what purpose? Mr. WAGNER. I wish to ask a question.

Mr. BILBO. Very well.

Mr. WAGNER. I wanted to ask whether the Senator would object if I submitted the report of the conference committee on the price control bill. I think its consideration will not take very The report is unanimous on the part of the conferees of both Houses.

Mr. BILBO. Is that the bill taking care of the people so far as meat is con-

cerned?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. BILBO. And giving the victims of the OPA the right to appeal to the judiciary of the country?

No; the Patman Mr. WAGNER. amendment, which dealt with the meat

situation, is accepted.

Mr. BILBO. I will not yield for a conference report which does not give the American citizen a right to appeal from the arbitrary imposition on the American people through the fool regulations of the OPA

Mr. WAGNER. The citizen has a right

to appeal.

Mr. BILBO. I did not know he had it. Mr. WAGNER. Yes, he has; he may appeal to the Emergency Court.

Mr. BILBO. Does any one object?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. WHITE. I make the same request with respect to this matter that I made with regard to the other.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator from North Dakota objects.

Mr. WHITE. There is a Senator who wishes to say something about the OPA conference report. If the Senator from New York will wait for 15 minutes, I know that Senator I have in mind will be in the Chamber, and I presume the Senator from Mississippi would yield then as readily as now.

Mr. BILBO. I am very sorry I cannot yield. My colleagues object. I do not, but they do.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President-

Mr. BILBO. Objection is made. I am not yielding for the purpose of making a report unless it is unanimous.

Mr. WHITE. The report is unanimous. Mr. BILBO. Does the Senator from North Dakota object?

Mr. LANGER. I object. Mr. BILBO. North Dakota objects. [Laughter.]

I wish now to go back to the editorial in the Mobile Register, and I shall read it from the beginning. It is as follows:

PROSPECTIVE NEW MOVE FOR MORE FEPC FUNDS SHOULD BE DEFEATED

When the Senate takes up the war agencies appropriation bill this week, a fight apparently is going to be made on the floor to add an appropriation for the so-called Fair Employment Practices Committee. The Senate will serve the interests of domestic har-mony if it defeats the maneuver.

The legislative picture on the FEPC is quite complicated. The agency has never been authorized by Congress, but was created by an Executive order of President Roosevelt on June 21, 1941, then re-created by another Executive order of May 23, 1943.

Last year Congress inserted a provision in the independent offices appropriation bill by which no appropriation may be used to pay the expenses of any agency after it has been in existence for more than a year, unless Congress specifically appropriates money for it or has authorized it to expend funds. That means the end of the FEPC after this fiscal year unless Congress puts more money in its hands, which Congress should not do.

A bill introduced in the House, seeking to establish the FEPC on a permanent basis, gained a favorable report by the Labor Committee, but has been unable to get beyond the Rules Committee. Representative MARY NORTON, New Jersey Democrat, chairman of the Labor Committee, is circulating a petition in an effort to discharge the Rules Committee from the bill, but the petition is far from the requisite 218 signatures.

The House Appropriations Committee this year refused to include an item for the FEPC in the war agencies appropriation bill, taking the position that the future of the outfit should be decided by the separate FEPC bill. No attempt to add an FEPC appropriation was made on the floor of the House when the war agencies bill was passed.

Mr. President, I have read that over for emphasis. The House takes the position that before any appropriation can be made the question as to whether this agency is going to be a permanent organization, should first be settled by the Congress. Then, if Congress sees fit to establish the FEPC as a permanent agency, there will be no trouble in getting an appropriation through because deficiency bills are coming in all the time, and the money can be obtained with which to operate the machine if the machine can be established.

The feeling of the House is, and the feeling of many people who are favorable to the FEPC is, that the right and proper and sequential thing to do is to wait and let the friends and sponsors of the FEPC fight it out, and ascertain whether they can persuade the Congress to make this a permanent organization. If they can, then we will provide the money which to operate it. If they cannot, then call it a day and quit, and quit on this appropriation right here. I mean, let it go dead next Monday.

The editorial in the Mobile Register continues:

The Senate appropriations committee on Thursday made a gesture about such an appropriation, but did not add it to the bill. The Constitution requires that appropriations originate in the House. Too, an FEPC appropriation, since the agency has not been authorized by law, if added by the Senate, would constitute new legislation in an appro-priation bill, forbidden by the Senate rules.

That is why, before we can take up the question of the appropriation of this \$446,000, a motion must be made and adopted by two-thirds of the Senate, and before that motion could be made there would have to be notice put on file, all of which has been complied with by the Senator from New Mexico. Of course, he did it at the behest of some members of the Committee on Appropriations; but any Member of the Senate could have filed notice before this bill came up, and could have gotten the same result as a

Senator from the committee. That is a right we all have. But the conditions have been complied with. When the amendment is called up for action it is subject to a point of order, and the Senator will have to make a motion to suspend the rule, and when that motion is made, if it is ever made, is when the filibuster on the pending bill is going to

The editorial concludes:

Actually what the Senate Appropriations Committee did was to authorize one of its members, Senator Chavez, Democrat from New Mexico, to move to suspend the Senate rules so that the FEPC appropriation could be added. But a motion to suspend the rules requires a two-thirds vote. The chance of that happening appears remote.

I do not know whether it is remote or not. If I knew that there was one more than a third of the Senate present and voting who would vote against the suspension of the rules, then I would not take longer. Speaking is hard work, and one has to be tired and hungry and mad to make a speech worth a darn. I do not like to speak, and if I knew we had the necessary votes to keep the rule from being suspended, I would say, "Let us vote now"; but I do not know.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is not tired and hungry right now, is he?

Mr. BILBO. No. I have not warmed up in my speech-making yet. I am neither tired nor hungry, and I am not mad either.

Thirty-three Senators are more than a third of the total when all Members are recorded. Because of its strife-creating aspects, the FEPC is widely disapproved in the South and a distinct sentiment of disap-proval is also found in the border States on the Pacific coast. These areas together have 86 Senators.

Last year the House Appropriations Committee put an appropriation for the FEPC in the war agencies bill. The House first voted by 141 to 103 to delete the appropriation, but later acted by a margin of four votes-123 to 119-to restore it. A motion in the Senate to delete the appropriation failed by 39 to 21. That, however, did not quite constitute a two-thirds pro-FEPC alinement.

On June 5 President Truman took the unusual step of asking the House Rules Committee to give clearance to the bill setting up a permanent FEPC. The committee declined a week later, by a six to six vote, to clear the bill.

Mr. President, I am not criticizing my good friend, the President, but he did an unusual, an extraordinary thing, when he wrote a letter to the committee and tried to influence the committee in its action. That is something I do not think President Roosevelt ever did.

Congress, as we have said before, should devote its attention to pressing worthy matters, not to the unworthy FEPC. The FEPC already has wasted too much public money in its meddlesome carryings-on. It should be discontinued before it has opportunity to do more damage.

Mr. President, in this connection I desire to read an amendment which I intend to offer on behalf of my friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] to the amendment which the Senator from New Mexico is going to offer, which is now on the desks of Senators. The proposed amendment is as follows:

Before the period at the end of the amendment, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of the funds ap-propriated in this act or in any other act shall be available for expenditure to carry out the functions vested in the Committee on Fair Employment Practice by Executive Orders Nos. 8802 and 9346 until, and then only so long as, such Executive orders are so amended as to impose the same prohibitions upon, and remedies to prevent, discrimina-tion against any person because of his membership or nonmembership in, or affiliation or nonaffiliation with, any labor organization as are imposed by such Executive orders with respect to discrimination against any person because of his race, creed, color, or national origin."

Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be received and printed, and placed on the desks of Senators.

There being no objection, the amendment was received and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I now wish to read to Senators a most surprising and unusual story concerning what is taking place in this country—the most surprising story I have read in many a day. This comes from the wife of the editor of the Washington Post, Mrs. Eugene Meyer:

WRITER PLEADS CASE OF SOUTH'S NEGRO GI'S

PRINCETON, N. J., June 26 .- Mrs. Eugene Meyer, writer and wife of the publisher of the Washington Post, sounded a warning today-

I wish Senators would listen to thisthat unless economic and social measures are taken immediately in the South-

Mark this, Senators-

in preparation for the returning Negro soldier, there will be another influx of Negroes into the North that would be "disastrous for the North and for the Nation."

Think of it, Senators. The wife of the editor of the Washington Post, Mrs. Eugene Meyer, speaking before a gathering in New Jersey, makes the statement that if something is not done in the South. and done at once, to change economic and social measures, when the Negro soldiers come back from this war they will not stay in the South but will make their way to the North, and she says this "will be disastrous for the North and for the Nation."

If I am not mistaken, Mr. President. the Washington Post has been a defender of all those who have been interested in this kind of legislation. I want to be fair. I know that the Post has taken occasion to lambast the devil out of me concerning my racial views.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may present a short resolution and ask for its adoption, with the understanding that the Senator from Mississippi will not lose

Mr. BILBO. Does anyone object, Mr. President?

Mr. LANGER. I object. Mr. BILBO. I am very sorry. Then I will proceed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question.

Mr. BILBO. I will.

Mr. LUCAS. Are the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from North Dakota now carrying on a filibuster?

Mr. BILBO. That is a military secret. Mr. President, I wonder why Mrs. Meyer, speaking in New Jersey, thinks that if these Negroes should come north it would be so disastrous. I thought a great deal of money had been spent by some people, and time and effort spent as well, in trying to educate the southern people how to handle the race question and how to treat the Negro. Now when the Negro is on the way to come up and pay them a visit and live with them they consider that to be disastrous. I should like to see every Negro in Mississippi move to Wisconsin. I wish they would all appear on the same day in Wisconsin.

I continue to read from the article:

Speaking at an all-day institute on migratory labor problems held at the Nassau Tavern under the sponsorship of Princeton Surveys and the industrial relations department of Princeton University, Mrs. Meyer said about the Negro soldiers who return to the South.

"When they return they are not going to put up with unemployment and political disenfranchisement, and lack of educational and health facilities they had to endure in the past. Either we move quickly to see to it that the South overcomes its economic handicap and its meager social provision for the Negro, or we shall see another Negro migration from the South to the slums of the North which will make the one that took place after the last war look like a mere

In other words, she is saying to the South, "You must get busy and do some-thing about the Negro. You must improve his economic conditions, his social conditions, and his educational conditions, and do it quickly, or when the Negroes come back they are all going north, and they will lodge in the slums of New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Chicago, and Detroit, and there will be no Negroes left in the South."

I hope they will all come north; if there is anything I can do or say that would cause them to come north, I will do it. I want the Negro to have his way. If he does not want to stay in the South, let him come north. His condition in the South is growing worse because all the farms of the South are being mechanized, and in the large prairie and delta sections of the South there will be no further use for him. He cannot be used as farm labor. Unfortunately, our industrial life has not yet been developed to the point where we can take care of the rural population if they decide to go to the cities and seek labor in industry. Therefore, if the Negro wants to come north, God bless him. I wish him well. If he does, when this war is over and I introduce my bill for the voluntary resettlement of the Negro in West Africa, we shall find Senators and Representatives from the North helping BILBO to make arrangements for the Negro to go back voluntarily to his homeland.

Prof. Paul S. Taylor, in the department of economics at the University of California. proposed that President Truman appoint an interdepartmental committee of Federal agencies to deal with problems of migratory labor. The meeting was attended by

representatives of Federal, State, labor, religious, and civic organizations.

I am surprised that anyone should object to the Negro's coming north. I am sure my friends from New York [Mr. Wagner and Mr. Mean] would not object, because they know how to handle the Negroes. The Negroes vote for them, and I am sure they would be glad if all the Negroes of Mississippi were to move to New York. They would be glad to have them. It would increase their majorities when they run for office.

I should like to read an editorial from Washington Post entitled "FEPC Filibuster." These things are synchronized logically and sequentially-from Mrs. Meyer to the editorial columns, from the wife to the editor. This is the edi-

Filibusters are never threatened by men willing to trust to majority rule.

That is a fundamental statement. In other words, it is never necessary to filibuster if one has a majority with him; but if the majority is against him, it becomes necessary to filibuster.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Mississippi a ques-

tion?

Mr. BILBO. But the mere fact that the majority is on one side of the question and the minority on the other is not conclusive proof that the majority is right, in a legislative body such as the United States Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question. Mr. CHAVEZ. In this particular instance, instead of a majority, my motion would require two-thirds.

Mr. BILBO. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is not the Senator from Mississippi willing to take a chance on one-third?

Mr. BILBO. In the case of a measure such as this, involving the question of votes and more votes, I can readily understand that it might be possible for

two-thirds to be wrong.
Mr. CHAVEZ. But the Senator is not willing to take a chance that they might

be right.

Mr. BILBO. I am afraid the twothirds would be like the Senator from New Mexico. I hope not.

Continuing with the editorial:

The die-hard foes of the FEPC, for example, know that their colleagues in the Senate, if given an opportunity, would vote for funds for continuance of the agency.

I know that; but let me say this about filibusters and majorities. There has never been a filibuster successfully conducted in the history of the United States Senate with respect to which time did not prove that the filibuster was right. The founding fathers knew what they were doing when they made this the one forum in the world where debate is unlimited. In times like these, and at other times in the history of the country, sentimental, emotional waves sweep over the country; and it is only here in the United States Senate that we can get together cool, able men willing to stand against the storm, and even to protect Members from other parts of the country

against their own constituents. When I stand here to fight and kill this damnable piece of legislation, I am protecting Senators from New York or Illinois, who know in their hearts that I am right. who know in their hearts that this is a damnable piece of legislation, who know in their hearts that it is wrong, but for political reasons cannot afford to say so. Their political lives are at stake. They want to come back to the Senate. I am their friend in the hour of their distress.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would the same political reasons apply to Senators on the other side of the question?

Mr. BILBO. They do not apply in my case, because I can be elected in Mississippi regardless of the FEPC.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hope the Senator can, but I am wondering whether or not some reasons of that kind might not be in mind once in a while.

Mr. BILBO. I do not claim perfection. I confess my limitations and weaknesses. There might be situations in which I would have to yield, as the Senator from Mexico has yielded.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator please say "New Mexico"? I am afraid there will be confusion. People will not know what he is talking about, and will say, "The good Senator from Mississippi confuses New Mexico with Mexico."

Mr. BILBO. I think the Senator is quite right, and I apologize for not saying "New Mexico" every time, because, the Senator being the sponsor of a measure of this character, people are likely to believe that it comes from Mexico. and not New Mexico. Hereafter I will protect the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am trying to protect the Senator from Mississippi, because I think he is making a good statement according to his own ideas, but if the people get the idea that he is confusing the State of New Mexico with the Republic of Mexico, they will say, "He is probably confused about the merits of

Mr. BILBO. It is possible that something good could come out of New Mexico.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a queston. Mr. McMAHON. May I inquire when the extended explanation is to stop and the filibuster commence?

Mr. BILBO. When I am convinced that one more than a third of the Senate will vote against the FEFC. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. BILBO. I continue to read from the editorial:

So they propose to frustrate the will of the majority by a species of legislative blackmail-not scrupling to hold up matters of vital national and international concern which await congressional action.

I wish to say that is an unjustifiable indictment by the Washington Post editorial, because I stand here ready to yield the floor at any time, as I did a while ago, for the passage of a bill appropriating \$38,000,000,000 for the war effort, and I was glad to yield the floor earlier today in order to hear the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally] give us his thrilling account of the fight made at San Francisco in the interest of permanent world peace, and I will yield again tomorrow to my good friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], provided some sponsor of the FEPC does not object. There will be no trouble about that; and I am ready to yield for the passage of the bill carrying appropriations for the 16 Government agencies if my friend the Senator from New Mexico will just kindly announce that he will not try to have the rule suspended and have this damnable poison of FEPC injected into the appropriation bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the

Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question. Mr. CHAVEZ. The question is this: Under the motion we are asking-

Mr. BILBO. Is the Senator asking me a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; I am going to. Under the motion, if agreed to, we will offer an amendment providing that an item of \$446,000 for FEPC be included. Is the Senator willing to jeopardize the

appropriations for the 16 agencies to which he has referred, merely because he does not like the darky of the South? Mr. BILBO. I am not. But the Senator from New Mexico is, because he is seeking to make a motion to inject into the bill an outside, extraneous matter

which has never shown up in the bill in the House of Representatives or in any committee. The Senator is planning to move to suspend the rule and to put this poison into the bill, when he knows he will be killing the 16 agencies if he at-

tempts to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. This item was included in last year's appropriation bill; was it not?

Mr. BILBO. I regretfully say "Yes." Mr. CHAVEZ. This item was included in the Budget as approved and submitted by the President of the United States to the Congress this year; was it not?

Mr. BILBO. I have not looked at the Budget, but I presume it is in there.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My motion is based upon instructions or authority from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BILBO. It is not based on any authority; the committee just told the Senator to do it, and he was willing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They voted 14 to 4 to ask me to do it. Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Well, they did.

Mr. CHAVEZ. W. Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is also correct; is it not?

Mr. BILBO. I was not there; I do not know.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Mississippi now feels, does he not, that the reason why he does not want to let it go to a vote is that he feels the opponents cannot get at least one-third; is not that correct?

Mr. BILBO. I am not going to take any chances on having it passed, because I am going to a funeral on Monday.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hope the Senator takes carnations. He will need them.

Mr. BILBO. I am preaching the funeral sermon in advance, but we are going to have the funeral on Monday. The FEPC is dead.

Mr. CHAVEZ. By that same means the Senator will kill 16 other agencies. If that satisfies his state of mind, it is all right with me.

Mr. BILBO. They will be dead if the Senator from New Mexico attempts to offer his motion or amendment. The Senator from New Mexico must make the choice. He can kill them by offering the amendment, or he can hold up the amendment and let the appropriations for the 16 agencies pass. I have been putting the Senator from New Mexico on notice for 2 days about what he is doing. He is committing suicide.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I assure my good friend the Senator from Mississippi that he can filibuster until doomsday, but that motion will be made.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Senator mean the motion will be offered?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It certainly will be ofered. Talk never did scare me.

Mr. BILBO. Well, if the Senator from New Mexico is so hell bent on doing it anyway, I may decide not to let him have a chance to put it on.

Mr. CHAVEZ. All right; if that is the case, the Senator can talk.

Mr. BILBO. I have the floor, and I am holding it.

Let me read further from the editorial:

This is the pattern they followed in the House as well as in the Senate. In the House, legislation to establish a statutory Fair Employment Practice Commission was kept bottled up by the Rules Committee, so that Members could not vote on it. And now in the Senate, a handful of bankrupt men propose to forbid even an appropriation for the existing FEPC created by Executive order 4 years ago.

I wonder what the editor of the Washington Post means by "handful of bankrupt men."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator may ask me a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well; I thank the Senator.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Senator know what the editor of the Post meant?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have a very definite idea.

Mr. BILBO. I will take the Senator's answer and will work on it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Well, when the Senator and I pray this evening, I will confess what the idea is.

Mr. BILBO. I am not a Catholic; I do not confess.

Mr. President, I repeat what I just read from the editorial:

And now in the Senate, a handful of bankrupt men propose to forbid even an appropriation for the existing FEPC created by executive order 4 years ago.

Here is a Republican newspaper which fought the Roosevelt New Deal administration all these years, and fought it bitterly. This newspaper denounced everyone who had anything to do with the New Deal; but now, at the eleventh hour, this newspaper denounces a Senator who happens to be in opposition to a measure which was brought into existence by threat and intimidation by a Negro by the name of A. Philip Randolph, who threatened to bring to Washington 200,000 Negroes to cause riot and trouble. That was the beginning of this damnable outrage.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I ask the Senator to let me conclude reading the editorial, and then he may ask his question.

The editorial says that they are "bankrupt men." In other words, there are approximately 25 or 30 Members of the Senate whom the Washington Post has denounced as being bankrupt men. I do not know whether the Washington Post means those Senators are bankrupt financially, bankrupt morally, bankrupt politically, or bankrupt intellectually. I do not know what kind of bankruptcy the writer of the editorial is talking about. If he is talking about a condition of financial bankruptcy, I do not think that is true. I do not think there is a Senator on this side of the Chamber who is opposing this fool legislation who is in a bankrupt condition. Such Senators may not be wealthy, but they are not bankrupt. If, by chance, any of them are financially bankrupt, they are preparing to remedy the situation, because I understand that the bill by which the salaries of Members of Congress will be increased to \$15,000 a year is ready to be passed, and it will straighten out that situation.

So far as mental bankruptcy is concerned-a condition of being bankrupt in respect to mental conceptions of good government-I think I am a good Democrat. I am not a Democrat just because I come from Mississippi. I am a Democrat in conviction because I believe in the principles of democracy. I certainly do not believe what Eugene Meyer believes. I do not believe in his policies or philosphy of government. If I must agree with Eugene Meyer's notion that the FEPC is his idea or concept of Federal law, in order for me to escape the denunciation of being bankrupt from a governmental or intellectual standpoint, then I will remain a bankrupt.

With a small staff and limited funds, the FEPC has worked effectively to break down the barriers of bigotry in American industry and to open up job opportunities for the members of disadvantaged minority groups.

Mr. President, it has just occurred to me what is the matter. I had forgotten that the editor of the Washington Post is a Jew, and I presume that his wife is a Jewess.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. They have been lined up from the very beginning with this minority called the Negro race in the fight which it is waging. There are exceptions, of course.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President-

Mr. BILBO. The Negroes, and the Jews in New York, as well as others who are working with them hand in hand—those are the minorities which the politicians fear—are the ones who have been back of this vicious legislation. Therefore, we find the editor of the Washington Post, a Jew, fighting against me, accusing me, and denouncing me and any other man who dares to disagree with him with regard to this proposed legislation, and calling us bankrupt men. I resent it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I ask my colleague a question?

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Has the Senator ever heard of a boy named Levine, who died in the Philippine Islands in the early days of the war? Has the Senator from Mississippi ever heard of him?

Mr. BILBO. I think I have. Mr. CHAVEZ. Was he a Jew? Mr. BILBO. I do not know.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Has the Senator heard of thousands and thousands of men who were Jews who made the supreme sacrifice, and are lying in graveyards in Tunisia, Africa, Sicily, Italy, Okinawa, Iwo Jima, and other places, side by side with boys from Mississippi?

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is there anything in the Constitution which says that a Jew cannot be a good American?

Mr. BILBO. Sit down a minute; I want to talk to the Senator. I am not saying anything against the Jew. I am not denouncing the Jews. I am a member of the Baptist Church, in good standing

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am a member of the Catholic Church, in good standing.

Mr. BILBO. Wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I just want to tell you that I am a good Catholic.

Mr. BILBO. You cannot get that on the Record. Wait a minute. You cannot talk now. I have the floor. I say that I am a Protestant in good standing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am a Catholic in good standing.

Mr. BILBO. Yes; and we both believe in Jesus Christ, who was a Jew.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I also hope that we both believe in American institutions.

Mr. BILBO. Moses was a Jew, Paul was a Jew, and Peter was a Jew also. They were all Jews. Do not intimate that I am trying to denounce the Jews. Some of the best friends I have in the world are of the Jewish faith. I am saying that Eugene Meyer is a Jew, and has denounced me as a bankrupt man because I am opposed to the pet scheme which the Negroes and the Jews in this country are trying to put over on the American businessmen, and the business enterprises of this country. That scheme would affect the North, South, East, and West. The question involved here is not a southern one. The petition which I have received from Atlanta has been referred to. One-fifth the persons referred to are Jews and Rabbis. If we examine this list of national organiza-tions we will see that they sponsor a membership consisting of approximately 90 percent of Negroes or Jews.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will my good friend

yield to me for a question?

Mr. BILBO. Not until I am through reading this editorial.

I repeat:

With a small staff and limited funds, the FEPC has worked effectively to break down the barriers of bigotry in American industry and to open job opportunities for the members of disadvantaged minority groups.

In doing this the agency helped significantly toward full mobilization of the Nation's manpower for prosecution of the war.

Mr. President, there is not a word of truth in that statement. It is the same kind of rot which appears in many other statements regarding the FEPC to the effect that the FEPC has brought together the labor of the country and made it possible for the great production program which was put into effect. I assert, Mr. President, there is not a word of truth in it. We had an excess of labor which would have done the job anyway, but the FEPC has been given the credit. The FEPC should not be given the credit. They had no power. They were merely a group of "sugar" boys with "lollypops going around the country. They said they were negotiating and were pacifying. As you know, Mr. President, we pacify with lollypops.

I continue reading:

It was intolerable that racial prejudice should have kept men out of mines and mills when men were desperately needed to carry on vital war work. And it remains intolerable today. The war is not ended, and the fullest use of manpower on our production lines is necessary to bring it to its speediest possible conclusion.

Mr. President, the only shortage of manpower of which Mr. McNutt has furnished any evidence has been on the Pacific coast. As I said awhile ago, that shortage was caused by the premature idea that the war was over when we finished with wiping up the Germans. It was not realized by many persons the amount of material, men, time, and munitions which would be required to carry on the war against Japan. A great many of us believe that the war with Japan will last from 1 to 3 years. I have always believed that it will last at least 2 years after VE-day. It must be a fight to the finish because the Japs have decided upon national suicide. We must kill them in order to get rid of them. I do not know as killing them off would be a mistake. Personally, I think the Jap is a heathen. He is an animal. He is a mongrel. He is an off-breed. I think he is hopeless. If I had my way about it I would enforce sterilization of the whole damn race.

I continue reading:

In the reconversion problems that will beset us with the war's end, the FEPC will be no less urgently needed.

The writer of this editorial wants the FEPC to be continued. Well, he is true to the gang he has organized.

It will be needed if the change-over from war to peace production is to be accomplished with minimum dislocation and with a decent regard for minority rights. It will be reeded as a symbol of the Government's concern if we are to preserve the faith of minority groups in the democratic process.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield to me, I should like to present a short resolution with the understanding that he will not lose his rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

Mr. BILBO. I am very sorry. I would not treat the Senator in that way if I were on the other side, but I am sorry. I wish I could yield to the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator can yield. Mr. BILBO. There are great stakes involved. I am sorry.

Mr. President, we thought the war was practically won. We once went through a reconversion period. We made a good We never heard anything job of it. about discriminations then. Seventyfive or 100 years have passed during which we had no law to regulate socalled discriminations. After 150 years of the Nation's life we suddenly find that the Washington Post, Walter White, Judge Hastie, Roy Wilkins, Governor Dewey, and other distinguished leaders-what a bunch-think that it is absolutely necessary that we have the FEPC and that we spend half a million dollars for 66 Negroes, 15 Jews, and a few white gentiles to galavant over the country with lollypops in order to pacify people, keep everybody at work and keep down discrimination. We have not had that in the past, and we have been getting along all right. There is nothing in it except that this is a concept arrived at back yonder in the corrupt center of New York, with Browder and a lot of others, Communists and Socialists. They conceived the idea of the FEPC, and it was carried to the waiting politicians, and they said, "We want this, Go after it."

I am told that this FEPC involves about 750,000 votes in the State of New York. In other words, if you do not play your cards right here, my Brother WAGNER, there are at least 750,000 voters in New York State who will vote against you the next time you run, if you do not keep your record straight on FEPC. That is a minority vote. There are the votes of the minorities in New York, that is, the Negroes, and the Jews, and the Italians, and a few Poles in the State of New York. There are about five or six hundred thousand Negroes in New York, most of them in Harlem, and about a million and a half or two million Jews. There are only 5,000,000 Jews in the United States and about 1.175,000 or 2,000,000 Jews in the State of New York. The rest of them are scattered around over the country. There are some in my State, and, by the way, they are the finest people in the world. They are fine citizens, they are exemplary citizens; and they all vote for Bilbo. [Laughter.] They are good people.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think I shall let the Senator proceed. I withdraw my question.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, while we are marking time, I wish to call attention to a petition from the State of California. Where did the Senator from California go? I received a petition from San Francisco, from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, San Francisco branch, reading as follows:

Senator THEODORE G. BILBO.

DEAR SENATOR BILBO: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution passed by the membership of our organization. Because you placed Mayor Lapham's position regarding fair employment legislation in the Congressional Record, we would appreciate your giving our statement the same courtesy.

Very truly yours,

VIRGINIA R. SEYMOUR.

Senators will remember that a few days ago the board of aldermen of the city of San Francisco drafted a resolution to be approved by the mayor, to be sent to the legislature at Sacramento, urging them to pass an FEPC measure for the State of California, and Mayor Lapham vetoed the action of his local city board and wrote a very strong, statesmanlike veto message giving his reasons why this is a fool piece of legislation and should not be passed by the State Legislature of California. I have not heard whether the legislature passed it or not.

The NAACP, which is a Negro organization, wrote a resolution in which they denounced "the man Bileo"—just like this editorial from the Post—and said some mean things about me, and asked me to put it in the Congressional Record. I shall not put it in the Record, certainly not, but I shall read my reply to them telling them why. I wrote them as follows:

JUNE 26, 1945.

VIRGINIA R. SEYMOUR,

Secretary, San Francisco, Calif.

Dear Secretary: I am just in receipt of your letter of June 22 enclosing a resolution passed unanimously by the San Francisco branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and I also note your audacious request that I insert your puny, untrue, ill-advised, partisan, mongrel resolution into the Congressional Record of the United States.

Your branch of the NAACP of San Francisco must be very ignorant and must think that I am a perfect idiotic fool. Why, you and your organization are so low and uncultured that you even refer to me in your so-called resolution as just "Bilbo, of Mississippi, democracy's worst enemy." Just ordinary well-breeding and culture would have compelled you to refer to me by my title as a Senator from Mississippi.

And when you say that I am democracy's worst enemy you admit your ignorance because you know nothing about my record as a public official even if I have been State senator, lieutenant governor, governor of my State for 8 years, and 12 years in the United States Senate. Your whole outfit knows absolutely nothing about democracy. It is my guess that your only concept of democracy is social equality between the white man and the Negro.

If your gang is going to follow this line of attack, let me warn you now that you are headed for wreck and ruin. You have got a great mayor of San Francisco and he is a straight thinker and gives evidence of knowing something about governmental affairs

and what is good for his people.

By the way, I am busy in fostering a program that will take care of folks of your intelligence and caliber. For sometime I have been following the leadership of Presidents Jefferson, Monroe, Madison, Lincoln, and Grant and other great statesmen of the past in trying to provide for the voluntary resettlement of the American Negro in west Africa, the richest country on earth, where you will have a country of your own and where you can aspire and ascend to the skies above.

No, I will not dignify your insulting and miserable little resolution by placing it in the archives of our great white American Republic. I am sorry.

Yours truly.

Mr. President, I received another letter, one from Georgia, which I wish to read. It is as follows:

DALTON, GA., June 26, 1945.

Hon. T. G. BILBO,

United States Senate.

Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Just recently I received from Senator Russell's office a copy of the speech you made on the FEPC Act some time ago in Congress.

Again, in yesterday's paper, I read of your stand on that contemptible act, and want to tell you how proud I am of your fight against

Today's papers carry a threat made by the president of the Pullman Porters' Union, which alone points the way to the danger of such a measure.

How comforting and encouraging is the fact that you, together with Senator John-STON and other southern statesmen, have promised to see that it never comes to a vote in the Senate.

With every good wish, I am.

I cannot give the name of the signer for the present. Here is a message from Houston, Tex.:

HOUSTON, TEX., June 25, 1945.

Senator Theo. G. Bileo, Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR BILBO: * * I am enclosing for your information Eleanor's letter appearing in today's Houston Press, which kindly read.

Please note she says the petition in behalf of FEPC is signed by many of Georgia's finest and most progressive citizens. I do not believe that

If the petition has been filed with someone in Washington, would it be possible for you to get a copy of same? Please advise.

Also please note they hook it up with the war effort, which they are trying to use to put the "nigger-sponsored" bill over. It has no connection with the war effort, the bill and report I have and have read, but is a law they want on the statute books after the war is over, to lord it over the white citizens, with Government sanction. And they want to do that before our boys get back from

Good luck to you in your work, and best wishes, and I hope to hear from you again.

Mr. President, these individuals desire to take advantage of the war situation and have FEPC legislation passed, get the law on the statute books, so the FEPC may become permanent, in order that they may use it as an instrument of punishment when the war is over.

Here is a hot letter from Jellico, Tenn., not from Jericho, but from Jellico:

DEAR SENATOR BILBO: We most earnestly urge you to use every means at your command to block the vicious FEPC bill. the free white people of the land of Alvin Yerk, Sergeant Huff, Old Hickory Jackson, Sam Houston, and Davy Crockett are behind you 100 percent.

Pretty good company, Mr. President.

Some of the persons pushing this bill, no doubt are sincere. However, the implications of the whole lay-out stink to the high

Your duties in this matter in safeguarding our sacred rights and traditions are heavy. However, we know you shall, with God's help, win your fight. If there is any way we can help you, call on us.

Sincerely yours.

I believe I will have the name of the writer of that letter printed in the RECORD. It comes from C. E. Mills, national president, Free White Americans, Inc

I have a telegram from dear old Kentucky-from Louisville-as follows:

Thanks for your unremitting efforts on behalf of South. Obviously countless thou-sands of southerners also fight for their way of life, a way which seeks a practical solution and precludes use of FEPO to create needless animosities.

If ever a truth was told, it was told in that telegram, which says that needless animosities will be created by this damn fool legislation.

I think it would be interesting at this juncture to tell the Senate of a little incident that happened last year. I read from an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, under date of June 17, as

RUSSELL HITS AT F. D. R. FOR SETTING UP FEPC—GEORGIAN CONTENDS PRESIDENT EX-CEEDED AUTHORITY-RACIAL ISSUE AT STAKE

WASHINGTON, June 17 .- Senator RUSSELL, Democrat, Georgia, Friday asserted in the Senate that President Roosevelt exceeded his wartime authority in setting up by Ex-ecutive order the Fair Employment Practice Committee to deal with racial discrimination in war plants and Government.

"I am a Democrat—proud of many of the accomplishments of my party, but I have never believed that the President of the United States was vested with a scintilla of authority to create an administrative agency such as this without the approval of Congress," Russell said.

He seeks to abolish the FEPC by striking its \$500,000 appropriation out of the war agencies bill, already through the House and now before the Senate.

CRITICAL OF CONGRESS

"The committee has sought to exercise powers that could be given to it only by legis-lative action," RUSSELL continued. "The people have been critical of Congress for allowing bureaucratic agencies to assume power in Washington." he said, describing the FEPC as one evidence "of this tendency of the executive branch to encroach upon the legislative branch of the Government.

The Senate adopted an amendment cutting the salary of Malcolm Ross, FEPC chairman, from \$10,000 to \$8,000 a year.

Ross told the House Labor Committee that to his knowledge FEPC policies do not circumvent southern racial segregation laws.

The witness called the committee's attention to a letter he sent Governor Stevenson of Texas in which he asserted that the FEPC is not advocating social equality but is concerned only with obtaining maximum efficiency in the war effort by eliminating racial discrimination.

Mr. President, he would force social equality upon those who have to work in

the offices and the plants. Yet, he says he is not encouraging that.

PRAISED AND REBUKED

In the Senate meanwhile, where southern Democrats are seeking to block a \$500,000 appropriation to finance the FEPC, Ross drew both praise and criticism.

Senator Danaher, Republican, of Connecticut, said the chairman had "strugged man-" toward the "laudable objective" of preventing discrimination "on a racial basis, on the basis of creed or a national origin."

Senator Bilbo, Democrat, of Mississippi, interrupted to ask how DANAHER explained what Bilbo termed "discrimination" on the committee itself. The Mississippian said there were twice as many Negro employees of FEPC although Negroes constitute less than 15 percent of the population.

"I assume he, Ross, sought qualified men and women among those colored employes who could work among their people," DANA-

HER said.

Bileo asked if he meant white people were not qualified to fill some of the posts.

DANAHER replied that he did not.

Mr. President, one of the strongest organizations of the FEPC clique in the South is the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. I have just received a letter from Miss Patricia Murphy Frank, the Washington representative of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 20, 1945. My DEAR SENATOR: We take pleasure in sending you the enclosed pamphlet by the Committee of Editors and Writers of the South, summarizing the voting restrictions in the 13 Southern States.

The growing demand by all Americans for a less restricted franchise is a concern of every citizen of the South and every southern organization.

The interest of the South's leading editors and writers is evidenced in the enclosed pamphlet.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICIA MURPHY FRANK. Washington Representative.

To that letter, enclosing the pamphlet, I made the following reply:

JUNE 23, 1945.

Mrs. PATRICIA MURPHY FRANK, Washington Representative, Southern Conference for Human Welfare,

Washington, D. C. MY DEAR MRS. FRANK: I was indeed surprised to receive your letter of June 20 en-closing me a copy of the "Voting Restric-tions in the 13 Southern States," prepared tions in the 13 Southern States," prepared by the Committee of Editors and Writers of the South. The most gratifying thing about this report that seems to have been sponsored by the mongrel organization known as the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is that not one single Quisling white editor who appears on the Committee of Editors and Writers of the South is from Mississippi. That is something to be really proud of.

By the way, this mongrel conference, op-erating under the misleading title of Hu-man Welfare, had a "get-together" dinner in Washington not long ago at which you had about 75 or 100 Negroes, Jewish people, and politicians and racketeers and so forth and several speeches were made.

Several Senators who were anxious to know just why this mongrel organization was awarding a Jefferson plaque to a member of the Supreme Bench employed a representative from one of the outstanding stenographic organizations of the Capital City and sent him down to this dinner to make a record of these speeches. We thought that someone among the speakers would "spill the beans" and tell the real reason why this memento was being bestowed upon a judge of the Supreme Court of the United States. The gentleman that went down representing the reporting agency was very promptly ushered out of the dinner or banquet hall and he reported that he was asked to leave by a man by the name of Frank. I am just wondering if you happen to be related or in any way connected with this man Frank who was actively in charge of the arrangements and admissions at this dinner.

A gentleman from the Department of the Interior was supposed to have been in charge but when I called him he said that a Mr. or Mrs. Frank or both were taking charge of the affair. I merely recite these facts in order to find out from you if possible if a stenographic report was made of the speeches on this occasion and if so could you assist me in securing a copy of all the speeches The group of Senators that I repre sent will be glad to pay a fair and reasonable

price for a copy of these speeches.

We have learned since this unfortunate affair took place that one of the speakers really did "spill the beans" and told the assembled crowd just what it was that this judge had helped to do that caused the Southern Conference for Human Welfare to bestow this award on him. I trust you will write me at your earliest convenience.

I am sure you will be glad to help me get at the truth about the plans, motives, and objectives of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare because in a short while I am going to make a speech on the floor of the Senate discussing this organization and all of its activities and its objectives. people need to know the truth about it. It is universally true that when a bunch of the alleged intelligentsia of the Negro race with a number of white Quislings, both from the South and the North, organize they have some very definite objectives to put over.

I regret to note that the purpose of your letter and the brochure that you sent me seem to be sponsoring the movement of the Negro minority to compel the Congress to pass a most definitely unconstitutional measure to repeal the poll-tax laws that obtain now in seven Southern States. I can very easily understand why some want to do this for political reasons and at the same time I know that quite a number of folks who are very active in this movement are just plain racketeers-they are out for the money they can get out of the organization of the movement to repeal the poll tax. My information has been that quite a sum of money has been extracted from unthinking and designing people throughout the United States.

Now I trust that you will take no offense in anything that I have set out or said in this letter because I have been very frank and I want you to answer me with the same frankness and tell me all you know about this organization since you subscribe yourself as being the Washington representative of this organization. And please do not forget about the speeches made at the banquet when your organization did the most unethical thing in the history of our country by rewardings a Justice of the Supreme Court for his opinions on the bench.

I trust I will be able to hear from you before the Senate is called upon to pass upon the anti-poll tax repeal bill that is now being considered by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

Yours truly.

Afterward I amended the letter by adding another paragraph, with the suggestion that I was sure that when the judge received his award, knowing that the same award had been bestowed upon an cutstanding Negro woman from Florida, he would not be so proud of it.

Here is a very interesting telegram from Houston, Tex.:

Houston, Tex., June 25, 1945.

Senator Bilbo,

Democrat, Mississippi, Washington, D. C.:

We have information Senate Appropriations Committee recommendations for funds to support FEPC for coming fiscal year will come up for action on Senate floor. We have four to one strike vote pending against FEPO directive Shell Refinery, Deer Park, Tex., em-ploying 1,600 workers. Doing everything possible to avoid shut-down of refinery; situation is becoming a racial problem and can be controlled if FEPC is eliminated. Urge that you and your colleagues do everything possible to eliminate the dissention and discord among industrial workers by continuing your fight against the appropriation of funds

for the activities of this committee.
A. J. Englishey Member Conciliation Committee.

This is from a member of the conciliation committee of a large organization employing 1,600 persons in Houston, Tex. He says that the FEPC has butted in and caused friction and disturbance, and he is praying that we kill this organization at the earliest possible moment, to save them from further trouble.

I have just received the following very interesting letter from my home State:

JUNE 20, 1945.

Hon. THEODORE G. EILEO,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Am writing this to congratulate you on your stand on two matters

recently brought up in the Senate.

1. Your speech published in Congressional. RECORD of June 13, 1945, page 6027. Appealing for deferment of action on the fair employment bill, also veto of action by Hon. Roger Lapham, mayor of San Francisco, an article from Boston Traveler of June 4, 1945, on same subject.

Your expressions before the Senate on this matter were absolutely correct. The passage of this bill with the creation of conditions affected by its operations would do untold harm. The principal objection being the fact that it places in the hands of five commissioners too much power.

The authority to punish offenders against its provisions for exercising their God-given right of freedom in choice, with the negation of use of free individual judgment, in selection of the men and women to serve or work, for the pay which is owned by the employing person or company. This bill gives abundant openings for frameups, witch hunting, intangible, unsupported accusations, which will cause constant conditions of mental insurrection against a law which has neither justice or plain "hoss sense" is not in any sense or way advisable.

There are too many laws already. The Congress should have more important things to do than to mess with this stuff. Imposing on our country a law which punishes both employees and employers will eventually cause thousands of cases of injustice, imposition, also financial losses.

2. The other case is the meddling of the Senate with private affairs of the A. & P. chain store president and those of Brig. Gen. Elliott Roosevelt. Another comment on this case is that A. & P. chain stores are getting back from the public every few days more than the loss of the \$200,000.

The writer of the letter seems to rejoice that Elliott put it over.

I read further:

The present combination of circumstances is causing the payment by the public "through the nose" to all chain stores, extravagant and in some instances extortionate prices—a very small portion of which is received by the producer.

The universally mourned President Frank-lin D. Roosevelt, like many other fathers, should not be held either morally, legally, or financially responsible for the mistakes of their adult progeny. Especially should this be the case as the facts are that his sons have acquitted themselves wonderfully in the military service of their country, have been honored, decorated, and promoted for brayery beyond the call of duty, with meritorious service in battle. The whole matter is no more business of the Congress than it is of

The matter of income tax by Mr. Hartford's making the deduction of the loss would seem to be the same as any other bad-debt loss. The revenue officials have passed on this.

There should be a decent respect for the dead. President or pauper, the columnists should let our Nation's idol rest in peace. We have troubles enough. Thank you for standing up for the right repeatedly, with every expression of esteem.

Cordially yours.

Here is a letter from Houston, Tex.:

JUNE 22, 1945.

Hon. THEODORE G. BILBO, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The most inconceivable plan ever concocted by the human mind is busy at work in bringing our great country a step nearer to the state of communism. I speak of the advocates who are attempting to force the FEPC upon our citizens.

This law represents that which is veno-mous to our American way of life and free enterprise. It represents regimentation of the people as were the peoples of Nazi Germany and like governments. It will foment hardships and racial strifes that will be an eyesore for years to come.

We have seen the probable results of such a statute as this committee was empowered to investigate discrimination during wartime, and each time we were encountered with strikes, race riots, and other disorders. Disturbances in Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Detroit attest to this fact. Well-informed persons need not refer to history books to ascertain how the South reacted to edicts handed down by this kangaroo court.

I trust that you will do everything in your power to eradicate the evil by its very roots.

Sincerely yours.

That letter has hit the bull's eye, because that is exactly what has happened and is going to happen.

If there is any virtue in the FEPC, we should have seen it by now. Today it is going full blast, and it has been for years; yet today we are having more strikes, more lay-offs, and more trouble in the industrial plants throughout our country than we have had at any time since the war began. The FEPC is not doing anything about it, because it cannot do anything about it.

The lollypops or the sugar boys-the boys who are complaining—are not satisfied. Therefore it will not do any good.

Here is a telegram from good old Philadelphia, Pa.:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., June 25, 1945. Senator THEODORE G. BILBO,

Senate Office Building: Urge you continue fight against Fair Employment Practices Commission.

Here is another telegram from Philadelphia:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., June 25, 1945. Senator THEODORE G. BILBO,

Senate Office Building:
More power to you in your fight against
Fair Employment Practices Commission.

I submit those telegrams for the RECORD for the benefit of my friend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Guffey].

You know, Mr. President, the most interesting thing that has happened in the last few days since this fight has been going on, and during the time that our colored brethren are complaining and have been complaining about the discrimination of the white man against the Negro, is that just a few days ago the War Department removed a general from a field of operations in Kentucky-a general who is a white man-and appointed Colonel Davis to take his place. It is interesting to note what happened when the change was made. The first order which Colonel Davis issued when he became head of the organization was to discharge every white officer in that field. Let me read what happened:

COLONEL DAVIS TRANSFERS ALL WHITE PERSONNEL

GODMAN FIELD, KY.—Less than 30 minutes after the final ceremony had ended here last Thursday, Col. B. O. Davis, Jr., had transferred all of the white personnel out of the Four Hundred and Seventy-seventh, and was busy at his desk reorganizing and shifting his Negro personnel into important positions. The colonel had gone to work with his traditional exactitude and brevity.

The order—transferring the white personnel—clearly demonstrated how Colonel Selway, at the instigation of General Hunter, commanding officer of the First Air Force, had usurped the cream of all of the important positions on the post for his white personnel.

IMPORTANT POSTS HELD BY WHITES

Under Colonel Selway not a single Negro held a position of importance, or any other kind, in the headquarters of the Four Hundred and Seventy-seventh. Besides Colonel Selway there were two lieutenant colonels, five majors, and one captain—all white—transferred cut of headquarters. There was only one Negro major on the whole field and he was a medical officer.

All four of the bombardment squadrons were headed by white personnel.

And so forth. In other words, that shows exactly what is in the heart, mind, conscience, subconscience, and so forth of the Negro race. Whenever they have the opportunity and the power to oppress, destroy, or defeat the white man anywhere, their inborn hatred is such that they do not fail to use it. Here is a case where the Negroes have been complaining for months because the War Department and the Navy Department are not giving them a square deal, so they say. Yet the minute that Negro got control of that field in Kentucky he fired every white officer in the organization and filled the positions with Negroes.

All Senators know the history of Liberia. Liberia was settled by 30,000 or 40,000 American Negroes who migrated from this country. The land in Liberia was owned by the American Colonization Society. In 1847 when the Negroes wanted to establish a republic of their own the American Colonization Society turned over to the Republic of Liberia all the land of Liberia, reserving half of it for the resettlement of other American Negroes in the years to come—it is there now, waiting for my friends the colored people—and they adopted the Constitu-

tion of the United States as the basis of their new government. The Negro was smart. He showed his spirit, his attitude, and what he would do when given the power. Only two amendments were made to the Constitution of the United States which the Republic of Liberia adopted in toto. Liberia has a president, vice president, a cabinet, and two houses, just as we have in the United States. However, the constitution was amended in two respects. First, no white man could ever vote in the Re-public of Liberia. That is a constitutional prohibition. Second, no white man in Liberia could ever own a foot of land. With those two amendments to the constitution, there was established the Republic in Liberia, which has the identical form of government which we have here.

The Negro had his opportunity. He had his day in court. He was the boss of the situation. He said to the white man in effect, "You may not vote in the Republic of Liberia. You may not own a foot of land in Liberia. You are swept off the face of the earth." That is the history of Negro action in all such cases.

Mr. President, I make the prophecy that the party which is responsible for the enactment of the FEPC, if it is ever enforced, will eventually pay the price. That price will be in the form of a defeat at the polls when the next elec-tion rolls around. We are all waiting for New York to begin enforcement of its FEPC law on July 1. The necessary machinery is organized and ready to operate. Appointments of commissioners have been made. They are traveling throughout the State of New York and are harassing, tantalizing, sniping, and snooping upon the business people of that State. The people of New York will be told whom they may hire and whom they may fire. I predict that when the law has been tried out it will become so unpopular, and will bring about so much dissatisfaction and cause such urgent protests that by the time the following election rolls around the men who are responsible for putting the FEPC upon the State statute books will be politically out of luck. The effect will be felt in the Congress. Some of the Members of Congress who are sponsoring this proposed legislation will find out that on the political judgment day the American people will not be so easily fooled as it had been thought they could be. In other words, Senators and Representatives will find out that, after all, a great majority of the voters of America are Christian white gentiles.

Mr. President, here is a letter which I received from Alabama:

DEAR SENATOR BILBO: I want to thank you for your prompt reply to my recent letter regarding Forest Douglass Herrington; also your assistance in this matter.

I and several other Mississippians, who are here only temporarily, heartily approve the stand you have taken with reference to the anti-poll-tax measure and the FEPC. The Communist and radical labor element here are trying to foster social and political equality. The CIO union has a Negro on their negotiation committee with the yard here, and Negroes and whites sit in the same meeting hall together.

Trusting that you and others will be able to defeat the anti-poll tax and FEPC, I am, Yours truly.

Here is a letter from Houston, Tex.:

Dear Senator Bileo: Congratulations on your stand against the nigger-sponsored Fair Employment Practice Committee bill, and I hope that you and your colleagues succeed in preventing the bill from coming up for a vote, or becoming a law, and from its appropriation being revived.

I have read a copy of the act, and Report 187 to accompany H. R. 2232, and as you say, it is so impossible, it is hard to understand how an intelligent person, if he has read the act, could sponsor it.

You, of course, know it is just a part of the nigger encroachment and social-equality program, taking advantage of anything they can during the absence of our boys overseas. It is not an economic measure in any respect, as they would have you believe it is.

I believe that you will agree with me, that Congress has many more important matters to give attention in behalf of our war effort, than to spend their time in behalf of the niggers, and squandering taxpayers' money in support of such a nonessential committee.

You know, too, Mr. Bilbo, that there is a lot of things that Congress could find to do in behalf of our white citizens, and I think they should come first. Don't you?

Good luck in your work, and I wish you and your colleagues success in blocking the passage of this measure.

Respectfully.

I believe it will be refreshing to read a letter from Chicago. Here is one which reads as follows:

CHICAGO, June 14, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR BILBO: Hearty congratulations on your courageous stand against the destructive forces that would cause trouble in the South and elsewhere.

That each individual State should deal with the poll tax is just plain common sense.

The killing of the Fair Employment Practice Committee in committee was indeed gratifying. Ninety percent of the people here are against it, and the country's thanks are due to you and your esteemed southern colleagues for your determined and successful stand in the matter.

The FEPC is, of course, unconstitutional, as it seeks to give special privileges in employment to the Negroes. The bill is a vicious one in every way and would stir up a lot of racial trouble throughout the land.

All good wishes to you, sir.

Yours sincerely.

That letter, Mr. President, is from Chicago, Ill. It represents the way people there feel about the situation.

I repeat, this is not a southern question; it is a national question. Here is a letter from Baton Rouge, La.:

DEAR SIR: You doubtless do not recall the writer, but I have known you from a young man, having been a resident of Hancock County, Miss., myself until was grown. No doubt you remember the family of the late Geo. W. Brown, of Pearlington, and you

were living at or near Poplarville, Miss.

Having followed your record in the Senate, especially in the poll-tax fight, however, we do not have one in this State, Louisiana, and have no trouble with the Negro, as they know where to stop, but do not think it is fair for the Government to try to take away any rights of the State or political party of the State, as that is an interference with State's rights, and hope that the bill before Congress will fail of passage.

The main reason for this latter is in regard to the bill to come up, the FEPC, which is about the same control as Congress would

impose in our elections. This FEPC bill is very obnoxious to our people and some of the northern Representatives and Senators are again trying to press this thing down our throats, and, in other words, place the Negro on an equality with the whites, and we do not, in the South, intend to stand for it. We believe in the Negro being given a chance to make something of himself, give him an education, and equal facilities with which to do this, however, we will handle this question better by the States themselves, than having it forced on us by the Government, as you are well aware what the results will be if it is forced on us, and this one thing will do more to open the wounds between the North and South, which it has taken over 60 years for us to try and heal, than any one thing that could be done. the North will let us alone and keep that Yankee Civil Liberties League out of the South, we will work this thing out for the best to all concerned, as the Negro knows that we southerners are their best friends, and will treat them well, as long as they stay in their places, but if this bill is passed by both Houses, we will, without doubt, have trouble with the younger set of Negroes, and will again have to take matters in our own hands for settlement, and understand me, Mr. Bilbo, this is not a threat, but from expressions I have heard from all sides it will not set well with the southerner. Am just a little sur-prised that President Truman would ask for the passage of such a bill as he knows it will make trouble later on, and Congress would do well to let the States handle this question in their own way, as we will work it out satisfactory to all concerned, without any trouble afterwards, and it is my earnest request that you, as a southerner and a Mississippian do your utmost to keep this bill from being passed, and if you cannot do that, keep it from passing as long as possible.

Have not written the Senators from Louisiana, Messrs. Overton and Ellender, but you may take it up with them and discuss it with them, as conversations with a great many of their constituency, they feel as I do about this bill and want it killed, as they think it will later breed trouble with the Negro, as was had in carpet-bagger days, which I hope will not occur, and whatever you

do, kill this bill.

Would be glad to have an expression from you as to the prospects of this bill passing, and if there is any possibility of getting enough votes to kill it. We do not need or want this bill forced on us.

With best regards and wishes for your suc-

cess, I am,

Yours very truly,

W. A. BROWN.

BATON ROUGE, LA.

Mr. President, I know the writer of this letter, and he is telling the Congress of the United States, through this letter, the truth about what will happen in the South if this proposal shall be enacted. Senators should begin to understand the reason for our great anxiety to put the bill out of business.

Here is a letter from the capital of my State:

We are opposed to the FEPC bill as we think it will be a troublemaker if enacted, and it will be harmful to all business, especially those located in the South. We trust you will vote against the passage of this bill when it comes up for a vote, as the FEPC will do more harm than good.

He did not tell me to do more than vote, but I am sure he will not object to what I am doing.

Here is a letter from North Little Rock.

DEAR SENATOR: It seems to me that now, of all times, we must subordinate sectional prejudices in favor of the national welfare and give to all citizens regardless of race, creed, or religion, equal opportunity to the basic rights of citizenship. Likewise, I am convinced that discriminations in employment on the same grounds form a real barrier to world peace and to future harmony and cooperation among the people here in the United States.

I do not believe we can afford any longer to pay the terrific price required to maintain these discriminations. Their cost to the people in terms of the ill will which they breed toward one's neighbors is too great.

For these considerations and many others, all in the general welfare, I hope you will give your support to the anti-poll-tax bill and to the bill for a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee, adequately financed.

I make this request of you with full knowledge of the South's traditions, for I am a southerner by birth, by residence, and by choice.

If you cannot support the two measures described above, then I would appreciate having your reasons for not doing so.

I replied as follows:

Your letter of June 9 has been received. I have read it with much concern. You state in your letter that you are a southerner by birth, by resident and by choice, but you did not say whether you belong to the white race or the colored race.

Please let me know a little more about your origin and the race to which you belong and I will take pleasure in telling you why I am not going to support either the FEPC or the anti-poll-tax bills.

Here is a letter from Bay Springs. Miss .:

DEAR SENATOR: While listening at the radio today, I heard that our President is pushing Congress to pass the Fair Labor Employment Practice Act. Was very much surprised at this because I thought that inasmuch as he lived in Missouri that he would at least understand the labor and race problems we are having in the South. He is doing a very unwise thing. The fact is, I think that if this becomes a law there will be many more lynchings in the South than heretofore.

Just after the last war it looked like we would have trouble with our Negroes, but in a few years everything passed over and it worked out all right. Am sure we will have trouble with our Negroes after this war and with a law of this kind passed by the Federal Government will certainly multiply our troubles

Do you think this bill has a chance to become a law?

Would like to hear from you about this.

I am sure the writer is sounding a note of warning that my colleagues should pay attention to if they love their country.

Here is a letter from the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Let us see what the head of the greatest farm organization in America says about the FEPC:

DEAR SENATOR: The board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at its meeting in Chicago on June 1, 1945, adopted a resolution against the proposed Fair Em-ployment Practices Act (S. 101).

Racial and religious prejudices should not be a part of the American system of enterprise, but the proposed legislation is the wrong way to correct such evils. This measure, in our opinion, would have the opposite effect from what its proponents claim. It would stir up—instead of allay—racial and religious prejudices, and would result in unhappy disturbances everywhere, which would interfere with-instead of promote-unity and maximum production.

The bill itself delegates to a Federal agency dangerous powers of regimentation over millions of citizens, and the decisions and orders of this Federal agency would be supreme. strikes right at the fundamentals of free enterprise.

We therefore respectfully urge that you oppose the enactment of S. 101. Sincerely yours.

That letter is signed by Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Here is a postcard from Topeka, Kans., under date of June 6, 1945, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., June 6, 1945. DEAR SENATOR: In the RECORD May 31 we read, which you inserted, Mayor Lapham's opinion of the FEPC. We must agree with the mayor that FEPC would completely destroy all individual freedom of the citizens, and would also destroy our American constitutional law form of government. Surely, those who advocate FEPC are seeking to give aid and comfort to enemies of our basic Constitution. Such persons should be apprehended. The FEPC is contrary to the immutable law of nature, that birds of a feather shall flock together. The FEPC would be a most terrible thing for the American Negroes.

Also we are glad to note you are again pushing your righteous idea of paying the expense of Negroes who desire to migrate to Liberia. It might be a good idea to fix a yearly quota for Negroes migrating. What is the matter with Congress? Why is the strange logic of the economy of scarcity tolerated?

Sincerely.

Mr. President, the writer of that card asks the question, "What is the matter with Congress?" I shall not undertake to answer that question.

I have here a telegram from Osceola, Ark., as follows:

Block the FEPC bill. Help Senator RAN-KIN. Counting on you.

Your friend.

I have a letter from one of the largest business concerns of my State, the Clark Manufacturing Co., as follows:

DEAR SIR: The writer wishes to take this opportunity to express his opposition to the above act, and we believe that you will agree with us that if this act is passed the white workers in the South will have every justification in revolting. We further believe that the white workers in the South positively will not under any circumstances submit to this type of law.

We want to take this opportunity to express our most emphatic opposition to this law, and to ask that you put forth every effort to defeat it.

Mr. President, the writer of that letter tells the Senate the truth when he says that the South will not observe such a law. It would take an army as large as the one used against Hitler to make us submit to it.

Here is a telegram from New York calling on me to support FEPC:

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 6, 1945. Hon. THEODORE BILBO.

United States Senate, Washington, D. C .:

On behalf of 20,000 laundry workers in greater New York we urge you to restore to war agencies appropriations bill the item for FEPC. The future of American democracy rests upon true equality for all its people, regardless of race, creed, or color, who gave their sons to preserve this democracy.

Mr. President, I suppose we did not have any democracy in the United States after the First World War, or during all the 150 years of our history when we did not have such a fool law as this.

The telegram is signed: "Laundry workers' joint board of Greater New York, ACWA; William Baron, manager, Roy Soden, assistant manager, Lewis Simon, secretary-treasurer."

I knew a Jew would show up in it before we got through with the matter.

This is my answer:

JUNE 7, 1945.

Manager William Baron, Assistant Manager Roy Soden, Secretary Louis Simon,

Laundry Workers Joint Board of Greater New York ACWA, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIRS: Your telegram of June 6 has been received and it was indeed a surprise to me. I had been informed that the State of New York had passed a FEPC bill under the pressure and support of Governor Dewey, who was making a bid for the Negro and Jew vote in New York with his support of this bill.

If you have it in New York and like it and want it, then keep it, but what right have you to try to cram this damnable un-American, unconstitutional, legislative monstrosity down the throats of all the people of this country? You are sowing to the wind and you will reap the whirlwind if you ever succeed in passing this damnphool legislation through the Congress.

Yours truly.

Let them keep that law in New York if they want it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to submit a matter, if I may obtain unanimous consent that by so doing the Senator from Mississippi will not be taken from the floor. I should like formally to submit a resolution, and read it into the Record.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object. Mr. OVERTON. No action is to be taken upon it. It is simply a resolution which I shall ask to have printed and to lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
Senator from Oregon objects.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator from the wild and wooly West objects. If the Senator from Louisiana wants the resolution submitted, hand it to me, and I will submit it for the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. I hand the resolution to the Senator from Mississippi with pleasure.

Mr. BILBO. I have the floor, and I will help my brother in a pinch. I am glad to. The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That when the United Nations Charter to maintain international peace and security, signed at San Francisco, Calif., on June 26, 1945—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object. Mr. BILBO (continuing reading):

shall be laid before the Senate for ratification, the injunction of secrecy shall be removed, it shall be read a first time, and the Senate shall thereupon proceed to consider the same in open executive session.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I inquire whether or not a Senator may submit a resolution at this time without the unanimous consent of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He may

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I have just read the resolution at the request of and on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, and I ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object. Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the objection. The resolution may not be received except by unanimous consent.

Mr. MORSE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may read it, but it may not be received without unanimous consent.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Chair rule that I may not submit the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It may not be received without unanimous consent. The Senator may read it, which he has done, but it may not be received without unanimous consent.

Mr. BILBO. I am submitting the resolution on behalf of a friend.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the resolution was merely sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been received.

Mr. OVERTON. It was sent to the desk to be printed and lie on the table. Mr. MORSE. I object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Acting Parliamentarian that the resolution may not be received.

Mr. BILBO. I am sorry to take issue with the Chair; but having the floor, I thought I could use it in any way I saw fit in the interest of my country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions and the submission of resolutions are out of order at this time. It requires unanimous consent, so the Senator may not submit the resolution at this stage.

Mr. BILBO. The Senate is in session following a recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The introduction of bills and joint resolutions and the submission of resolutions are in order only during the morning hour.

Mr. BILBO. We have no regular order at this time, and there is no question of germaneness. The Senate does not recognize the rule of germaneness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the resolution may not be received at this time.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I am pleased to read to the Senate at this time a letter from Washington, D. C., on the FEPC:

Washington, D. C., June 6, 1945. Hon. Theo. Bilbo,

United States Senate Office.

Dear Senator: Knowing your valiant fight for true Americanism, which southerners know better than any others, I call attention to the vigorous Negro propaganda for "equality," etc., I wish some Congressmen could see the Negro supervisors with

white stenographers, or vice versa, and see a smart-Alec Negro multigraph operator "visiting" and lounging on the drafting table of a young, pretty white girl, who thinks she must be polite to the black.

Why not ridicule the clever name the FEPC uses? Call it Forcing Ethiopian Practices on Caucasians, or in private conversation, even more bestial designation.

May God add to your strength,

That is a sad commentary from my standpoint. Of course, to some who have different tastes, or no sense of taste or smell, it is all right.

Mr. President, I wish to read a letter from Detroit, Mich. There has been some trouble out there recently. The letter is as follows:

JUNE 1, 1945.

The Honorable THEODORE G. BILEO,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR BILBO: The writer read with
great interest in the Congressional Record,
date, May 24, 1945, the senatorial proceedings and the discussion on the FEPC between
you and Senator Chavez.

It need not be stated that the writer's sympathies, of course, are with your opinion.

Indeed the FFPC should be called the

Indeed, the FEPC should be called the UEPC-

Or Unfair Employment Practice Committee—

The tragedy reigns in the fact that only the legislators of the South seem, so far, to have raised their voices against this monstrosity of a law which might be forced upon the American people. All others, either because they are afraid or because of previous commitments, political or otherwise, either show a favorable attitude to the FEPC or keep silent about it.

This, of course, is evidently directly attributable to the large number of African voters that have penetrated and infiltrated themselves in the political structure of their various districts. The labor organizations, oddly enough, are going the limit by advocating openly and brazenly such exophrenities as "unsegregated housing," "civil rights," the latter to the tune of one's having to serve members of the African race in one's restaurant, dance hall, tavern, jewelry store, or what there be.

The newspapers of the members of the African race are most highly inflammatory, if not actually seditious. Protests are registered, for example, "against a white man's kind of peace. One such magazine once had a most cleverly worded article about how the Japanese asked for racial equality at Versailles, and it was thrown overboard by the "lily-white tower dwellers."

Our country, Mr. Bilbo, is in danger, grave danger. Our well-being, our racial integrity, likewise. This is the way in which it will come about. It is plain to be seen now that the African minority is fast becoming a majority through its prolificness. The Caucasian race is not. In 50 to 100 years the racial character of this country will not be the same as it is now. Therefore, something should be done now to avert the danger. "Back to Africa" is a fine slogan, regardless of what the avaricious, piteously temporary opportunists say.

Enclosed find also a cartoon clipping from one of the above-mentioned newspapers.

He is right in everything he says except as to the time he fixes for the change in complexion in the population of this country. We shall all be yellow after a while unless there is a separation of the races. The only reason I have not been able so far to arouse the American people over that issue is that they know it will not happen in their lifetime or in

the lifetime of their children; but as sure as there is a God in heaven it is going to happen. Since it does not happen to you or yours, you do not seem to give a continental dried apple whoop.

Here is another letter:

MAY 18, 1945.

Hon. THEO. G. BILBO, United States Senator.

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We certainly hope that you will oppose to the very last bill H. R. 2232, the Fair Employment Practice Act. We think this is a most vicious bill and we believe that, at least, our southern representatives will op-

pose it to the very last.

Another thing, we wish, at the same time, if it is at all possible, that you could do away with the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, as we notice from a list we have the salaries that are being paid in the dif-ferent departments. We think you could save the Government a whole lot of money if you would do away with this committee entirely as we can see no good that they are doing, or will do. This is a good place to economize and we certainly think we need it wherever it is possible.

Anyway, we are certainly in hopes that you will fight this bill to the very last.

With kindest regards, we are,

Yours very truly.

He shall not be disappointed.

Here is a letter from a very fine gentleman and a very fine businessman. He is not a wild, easily agitated character, but he is quiet, sober, and thoughtful:

MAY 15, 1945.

Senator THEO. G. BILBO, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BILBO: We have given considerable thought and study to measure H. R. 2232 pending in Congress. To us it seems that this measure if allowed to become a law might result in something that would be very disastrous to any employer of six or more people.

It would seem that the purpose of this measure is to prevent discrimination against other races than white. Frankly, as much as 50 percent of our labor over a period of years has been colored. We have never experienced any trouble or dissatisfaction to mention with our colored labor. that nothing will ever come about that would interfere with out colored labor.

If this bill should pass, it appears to us it would be an opening to racketeers to come in and create disturbance and dissatisfaction, and would definitely disrupt labor.

We would appreciate it if you would make a close investigation of this bill, and if in your good judgment you would see our point in writing you regarding this, you would register your disapproval in Congress of the

Very truly yours.

Well, Mr. President, I have done all those things, and now I am registering my disapproval.

Here is a letter from one of the largest lumber companies in my State. It is signed by a very high-class thinking

MAY 15, 1945.

Hon. Senator THEODORE BILBO,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: After some study of bill H. R. 2232, which is now pending in Congress, known as the Fair Employment Practice Act, we can see no good in this form of legislation if passed.

We understand the bill delegates tremendous legislative and judicial powers to a bureau whose decisions would be supreme. This would affect the private property rights of the people, and is a departure from the traditional American system of free enter-prise in that a man will no longer be free to pass judgment on the choice of his employees, to surround himself with men of ability and integrity for the successful operation of his business and the protection of his investment.

This measure will not be defeated unless we fight it with every means at our command! To this end we solicit your untiring effort in behalf of, especially, southern businessmen's interest, for the defeat of this new type of Fascist regulation.

We sincerely hope that you give this measure your close study and join us in the defeat of same.

Yours very truly.

There is no wild, radical denunciation in a letter of that type. That letter was written by an outstanding, successful businessman who knows the situation, who know the races, and who knows the issue. He tells frankly what is going to happen to the business interests of our country. What he says will happen in Mississippi and will happen throughout the Nation; it will even happen in New

Now I wish to read some observations from a very interesting publication from Mr. Merwin K. Hart, of New York. I am going to read it without knowing where he is going to land, but I invite attention to it:

THE ANTI-RACE-BIAS BILLS

Because bills more or less similar to the New York antidiscrimination bill will be pressed in most States and in Congress, and because it is so controversial, we devote this letter to the pending New York measure.

In 1935, the Workers Library Publishers (50 communistic book shops operated in 40 American cities) published a 48-page pam-phlet entitled "The Negroes in a Soviet America," by James W. Ford and James S. Allen. Ford, a prominent Harlem leader, was several times Communist candidate for Vice President. Regardless of how many Communist organizations are said to have been "abolished"-regardless of how many official denials or evasions may come from Communist sources—this pamphlet sets forth clear Communist doctrine.

It starts out by announcing a "great crisis." The Negro people can find inspiration in the revolutionary attempts of Gabriel, Denmark Vesey, Nat Turner * * *."

Albert Bushnell Hart's History of the American Nation, volume XVI, says two of these three were leaders of bloody revolts in which white men, women, and children were mercilessly slaughtered.

So, in 1935 the Communist Party of the United States of America was inciting the Negroes to revolution as bloody as any Rusever saw.

Of course, the authors of the Negroes in a Soviet America did not expect to attain this bloody revolution immediately. So they set forth certain minimum desires of the Negro masses, and these they define as:

"1. A decent and secure livelihood;
"2. The rights of human beings; "3. An equal, honorable, and respected, status in all public and social life."

Since the Communists throughout their history have made full use of the tactic of fomenting discord and ill-feeling, racial and religious, it is fair to believe the proposed law against discrimination, commonly known as the anti-race-bias bill, had its inspiration in Communist policy. By this law it is proposed in New York that public and social equality be assured the Negroes by statute.

In other words, by that statute the Negro would get what he is not entitled to get and what he cannot get otherwise because of his traits and his character and his race, and so forth. In other words, it is proposed that we legislate equality and that we legislate social conditions, and that we make the world over, without letting our people exercise any choice or preference. This is the new idea. It is Communist stuff.

I read further from the publication:

The law against discrimination was drafted by a commission appointed by the Governor and the legislature. Hearings were held in November and December in several cities, including New York. On the next to the last day of the hearings the president of the National Economic Council appeared in opposition. The New York Times, in its account of that hearing, stated he was the sixty-ninth witness on the bill and the first one to appear against it.

I have not examined the matter thoroughly. I do not know whether any witnesses appeared in opposition or not. I doubt it.

I continue reading:

The commission asserted business organizations had been notified of the hearings, but none appeared against the bill. The fact most businessmen are occupied in the phenomenally successful effort of private enterprise to produce war and other material for our fighting forces, may perhaps explain why the bill escaped their notice.

The New York bill received momentum because the Governor and certain leaders of the legislature felt constrained to vie with one another in the effort to sponsor the bill and gain the credit for passing it.

The bill sets up a commission of five men at \$10,000 a year; and it has all the usual provisions for attorneys, clerks, and other employees and agents as it may deem neces-This commission will have power, under penalty of fine and imprisonment, to compel employers to accept as employees persons of any race, creed, color, or national origin; and to compel employees to accept as fellow employees persons of the same types. It allows the commission to issue orders commanding an employee or a fellow employee to be accepted, not on a prepon-derance of the evidence, but on "sufficient evidence on the record considered as a whole"-whatever that may mean. opens the door to injustices like those under the one-sided National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. Garet Barrett, in The Revolution Was, has pointed out that the various New Deal measures of recent years, viewed from the standpoint of American and general human experience, are in their totality completely cockeyed; but if viewed from the standpoint of revolution, they form a perfect pattern.

This bill looks toward revolution in the State of New York. Social race equality is a cardinal point in Communist doctrine. passage of such an act at any time would be a greater trouble breeder than the eighteenth amendment. But to pass it now, when national unity is vital, when employers and employees alike should have their attention undiverted by friction, is a move which the American people from coast to coast will do well to note and ponder—and wherever they can to prevent.

The hatching of this idea, as of so many others, undoubtedly took place among alien-minded elements in New York City. If any people in the country are not already warned against these mischlevous or misguided New Yorkers, they should be warned now. Not by any means are these activities confined to aliens, however. They have been taken up as a cult or fad by some of our best people. In many social, professional, and even business circles, more thought seems to be given to appeasing communism than to the support of the American Nation itself.

New York and Washington are close together in this apparent conspiracy to sell the United States out. There have been many disquieting incidents. Our readers will recall the mysterious efforts months ago to destroy the Communist records of our Military and Naval Intelligence. Only a few days ago it was announced the War Department had rescinded restrictions against the commissioning of Communists as officers in the armed services—this when our men are dying by the thousands and tens of thousands, supposedly for the cause of freedom.

In the New York Herald Tribune of February 22, 1945, we found no reference in editorial or news columns to the fact it was the birthday of George Washington. We did find a column article with the headline "3,000 in tribute to Red army at Carnegie Hall." We found an article by Maurice Hindus with the headline "Reds' prime goal called death of fascism in all disguises"—and we recall that Fascist, in this country, means anybody opposed to communism.

On the very day of the hearing on the law against discrimination at Albany, where leftist orators and others implied that Negroes in the United States have no chance, a New York paper published a column article stating that Gaius C. Bolin, a Negro lawyer 80 years of age, had the previous day been elected president of the Dutchess County Bar Association. Almost the same day Smith College announced the appointment of a Negro to its faculty. We attended some years ago one of the sessions of a 3-day meeting at Lake Placid, N. Y., of Negroes who came from all sections of the country to pay tribute to John Brown on the anniversary of his birth; and the attendants included scores of lawyers, doctors, businessmen, and other Negroes, all of whom, with credit to themselves, had climbed well up the ladder of success.

We are concerned for the condition of the Negroes and of any group in this country that is discriminated against. Undoubtedly there are cases of discrimination. But the way to aid them is not by statutory compulsion either by legislature or by Congress. Fines and imprisonments under this law will anger the vast majority of Americans and will stir up serious trouble for the very people the law is intended to benefit.

The problem of how these people can be better assimilated could be aided if a State legislature by joint resolution authorized the mayor of any city, in his discretion, to appoint a small committee of discreet, tactful, able, and high-minded citizens whose business it would be, by private conference behind the scenes, to smooth out some of the difficulties involved. Such a proposal would cost practically nothing. It may not appeal to certain politicians—for they can see no votes or jobs in it. But it would genuinely help to reduce race discrimination. And, if Communist agitators and professional dogooders would pipe down, and give us a rest, it would make for the greater peace of the country.

We commend this whole matter to the thoughtful consideration of persons throughout the United States.

MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic
Council, Inc.

Mr. President, what I have been reading originated in the State of the senior Senator and the junior Senator of New York [Mr. Wagner and Mr. Mead].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I think there should be more Senators in attendance in order that they may hear these wonderful arguments, and if the

Senator will yield to me, I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield for that purpose?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ellender McMahon Ferguson Fulbright Mead Millikin Bailey George Guffey Ball Mitchell Bankhead Barkley Murdock Gurney Myers O'Mahoney Brewster Hill Overton Radcliffe Hoey . Johnston, S. C. Burton Byrd Kilgore La Follette Stewart Taft Capper Langer Lucas McClellan Thomas, Utah Chavez Tunnell Cordon Donnell Wagner McFarland McKellar Wherry Eastland

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fiftyone Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 30, extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the conference report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to object to the presentation of the report. Is this the proper time to raise the objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection let me say that a conference report is a privileged matter and an objection will not avail, because the Senator from New York can move to take it up, and that motion is not subject to objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 30) extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That section 1 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1945" and substituting "June 30, 1946."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1945" and substituting "June 30, 1946."

SEC. 3. Section 2 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this Act, he shall issue a declaration setting forth the necessity for, and recommendations with reference to, the stabilization or reduction of rents for any defense-area housing accommodations within a particular defense-rental area. If within sixty days after the issuance of any such recommendations rents for any such accommodations within such defenserental area have not in the judgment of the Administrator been stabilized or reduced by State or local regulation, or otherwise, in accordance with the recommendations, the Administrator may by regulation or order establish such maximum rent or maximum rents for such accommodations as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of this Act. So far as practicable, in establishing any maximum rent for any defense-area housing accommodations, the Administrator shall as certain and give due consideration to the rents prevailing for such accommodations, or comparable accommodations, on or about April 1, 1941 (or if, prior or subsequent to April 1, 1941, defense activities shall have resulted or threatened to result in increases in rents for housing accommodations in such area inconsistent with the purposes of this Act, then on or about a date (not earlier than April 1, 1940), which in the judgment of the Administrator, does not reflect such increases), and he shall make adjustments for such relevant factors as he may determine and deem to be of general applicability in respect of such accommodations, including increases or decreases in property taxes and other costs within such defense-rental area. In designating defense-rental areas, in prescribing regulations and orders establishing maximum rents for such accommodations, and in selecting persons to administer such regulations and orders, the Administrator shall, to such extent as he determines to be practicable, consider any recommendations which may be made by State and local officials concerned with housing or rental conditions in any defense-rental area. Whenever the Administrator shall find that, in any defense-rental area or any portion thereof specified by him, the availability of adequate rental housing accommodations and other relevant factors are such as to make rent control unnecessary for the purpose of eliminating speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in rents and of preventing profiteering, and speculative and other disruptive practices resulting from abnormal market conditions caused by congestion, the controls imposed upon rents by authority of this Act in such defense-rental area or portion thereof shall be forthwith abolished; but whenever in the judgment of the Administrator it is necessary or proper, in order to effectuate the purpose of this Act, to reestablish the regulation of rents in any such defense-rental area or portion thereof, he may forthwith by regulation or order reestablish maximum rents for housing accommodations therein in accordance with the standards set forth in this Act. Before issuing any regulation or order under the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Administrator shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with representative members of the industry which will be affected by such regulation or order, and shall give consideration to their recommendations. The Administrator shall, at the request of any substantial portion of the industry subject to such regulation or order of the Administrator, appoint a national industry advisory committee, or committees, in the same manner and form and with the same powers and duties as provided in subsection (a) for industry advisory committees relating to price."

SEC. 4. Section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(n) In establishing or maintaining maximum prices under this Act or otherwise in the case of collect-on-delivery sales of any commodity where under established practices of the seller a uniform charge is added to the price to cover mailing costs, an increase in maximum prices shall be allowed equivalent to any increase in such costs heretofore or hereafter resulting from increased postal rates or charges."

SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (e) of section 3 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law, no action shall be taken under this Act by the Administrator or any other person, without prior written approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to any agricultural commodity or with respect to any regulation, order, price schedule or other requirement applicable to any processor with respect to any food or feed product processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity; except that (1) the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any individual adjustment making an increase in a maximum price, and (2) the Administrator may take such action as may be necessary under sec-tion 202 and section 205 to enforce compliance with any regulation, order, price schedule, or other requirement, which is lawfully in effect."

(b) Section 302 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting after paragraph (k) thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(1) The term 'agricultural commodity' includes livestock."

SEC. 6. Section 204 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) (1) Within thirty days after arraignment, or such additional time as the court may allow for good cause shown, in any criminal proceeding, and within five days after judgment in any civil or criminal proceeding, brought pursuant to section 205 of this Act or section 37 of the Criminal Code, involving alleged violation of any provision of any regulation or order issued under section 2 or of any price schedule effective in accordance with the provisions of section 206, the defendant may apply to the court in which the proceeding is pending for leave to file in the Emergency Court of Appeals a complaint against the Administrator setting forth objections to the validity of any provision which the defendant is alleged to have violated or conspired to violate. The court in which the proceeding is pending shall grant such leave with respect to any objection which it finds is made in good faith and with respect to which it finds there is reasonable and substantial excuse for the defendant's failure to present such objection in a protest filed in accordance with section 203 (a). Upon the filing of a complaint pursuant to and within thirty days from the granting of such leave, the Emergency Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction to enjoin or set aside in whole or in part of the provision of the regulation, order or price schedule complained of or to dismiss the complaint. The court may authorize the introduction of evidence, either to the Administrator or directly to the court, in accordance with subsection (a) of this section. The provisions of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall be applicable with respect to any proceeding insti-tuted in accordance with this subsection.

"(2) In any proceeding brought pursuant to section 205 of this Act or section 37 of the Criminal Code, involving an alleged violation of any provision of any such regulation, order or price schedule, the court shall stay the proceeding-

(i) during the period within which a complaint may be filed in the Emergency Court of Appeals pursuant to leave granted under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect

to such provision;
"(ii) during the pendency of any protest properly filed by the defendant under section 203 prior to the institution of the proceeding under section 205 of this Act or section 37 of the Criminal Code, setting forth objections to the validity of such provision which the court finds to have been made in

good faith; and

"(iii) during the pendency of any judicial proceeding instituted by the defendant under this section with respect to such protest or instituted by the defendant under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision, and until the expiration of the time allowed in this section for the taking of further proceedings with respect thereto. Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, stays shall be granted thereunder in civil proceedings only after judgment and upon application made within five days after judgment. Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, in the case of a proceeding under section 205 (a) the court granting a stay under this paragraph shall issue a temporary injunction or restraining order enjoining or restraining, during the period of the stay, violations by the defendant of any provision of the regulation, order, or price schedule involved in the proceeding. If any provision of a regulation, order, schedule is determined to be invalid by judgment of the Emergency Court of Appeals which has become effective in accordance with section 204 (b), any proceeding pending in any court shall be dismissed, and any judgment in such proceeding vacated, to the extent that such proceeding or judgment is based upon violation of such provision. Ex-cept as provided in this subsection, the pendency of any protest under section 203, or judicial proceding under this section, shall not be grounds for staying any proceeding brought pursuant to section 205 of this Act or section 37 of the Criminal Code; nor, except as provided in this subsection, shall any retroactive effect be given to any judgment setting aside a provision of a regulation or order issued under section 2 or of a price schedule effective in accordance with the provisions of section 206."

SEC. 7. Section 3 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That on and after the date of the enactment of this proviso, no maxi-mum prices shall be established or maintained on products resulting from the processing of cattle and calves, lambs and sheep, and hogs, the processing of each species being separately considered, which, taken together, do not allow for a reasonable margin of profit to the processing industry as a group on each such species."

SEC. 8. The Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 3 thereof a new section as follows:
"Sec. 3A. (a) While this Act is in effect, no

quota or other slaughtering limitation shall be imposed upon any slaughterer of animals, under authority of this or any other law, if the Secretary of Agriculture has certified that the slaughtering plant is operated under sanitary conditions and that the meat produced therein is clean, wholesome, and suitable for human consumption; but certification under this section shall not be made with respect to any slaughtering plant (1) at which inspection is maintained under the Act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1260), with respect to all its slaughtering operations,

or, (2) at which such inspection under such Act was previously maintained if, in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, the slaughterer withdrew such plant from such inspection for the purpose of applying for certification under this section. "(b) As a condition of making certifica-

tion in the case of any such slaughterer, the Secretary of Agriculture may require that such slaughterer make available to the armed services of the United States, or for Government purchase, such percentage of the meat slaughtered and processed as he may deem necessary or advisable.

"(c) The Secretary of Agriculture may make the certification provided for under subsection (a) with respect to a designated part of a slaughtering plant without making such certification with respect to the remainder of such slaughtering plant, in which event the provisions of this section shall apply only to meat produced in such

designated part of the slaughtering plant.

"(d) In order that he may make the certifications provided for under subsection (a), the Secretary of Agriculture may provide for inspection in such manner and by such persons as he may deem advisable.

"(e) Meat which is produced under the circumstances specified in this section shall have the same status for transportation in interstate or foreign commerce, when properly identified in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, as meat produced in plants at which inspection is maintained under the Act of March

4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1260).
"(f) The Secretary of Agriculture may refuse or revoke certification in any case when he is not satisfied that the meat made available hereunder will be disposed of in legitimate trade channels in accordance with law.

'(g) The Secretary of Agriculture may revoke any certification under subsection (a) if it is found at any time that the slaughterer does not meet each of the conditions required under this section.

(h) Nothing in this section shall prevent the termination, suspension, or limitation of the right of any person to slaughter if such person fails to comply with the price, rationing, or slaughter control requirements imposed under the authority of this or any other law.

And the House agree to the same,

ROBERT F. WAGNER, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, J. H. BANKHEAD, GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, CHARLES W. TOBEY, ROBERT TAFT, HUGH BUTLER

Managers on the Part of the Senate. BRENT SPENCE,

PAUL BROWN. Per M. M. WRIGHT PATMAN, MIKE MONEONEY, JESSE P. WOLCOTT, FRED L. CRAWFORD, RALPH A. GAMBLE, Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make inquiry as to whether the Senator from Mississippi has lost the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] now has the floor.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. WAGNER. Before the report is agreed to I wish to speak of some of the changes which have been made. The first two sections are exactly the same as the first two sections of the joint resolution as it passed the Senate. These sections extend the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and the Stabilization Act of 1942 for 1 year, from June 30, 1945, until June 30, 1946. That was agreed to by both Houses, so there is no change in that.

Section 3 of the conference agreement is a modified form of the provision in the joint resolution as it passed the House which is known as the Baldwin amendment. This section amends section 2 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act by adding two new sentences at the end of that section. These new provisions require that the Price Administrator, before issuing any maximum rent regulation or order, shall, insofar as practicable, advise and consult with representative members of the rental industry, and shall give consideration to their recommendations. The new provisions also provide for the appointment by the Price Administrator of a national advisory committee, or committees, for rent. These new provisions provide for consultation with the rental industry with respect to rent control matters in a manner comparable to that which is already provided in the price control provisions of the law for industries subject to price control. As a matter of fact, the Price Administrator already has an advisory rent committee with which he has been consulting on an informal basis; so the effect of this amendment, in large measure, is to give statutory recognition to an administrative policy which is already being followed.

Mr. President, I believe the method I am following permits an easier and more accurate presentation of the ex-

planation of the report.

Section 4 of the conference agreement is the same as the Senate provision which is known as the Wiley amendment. This section amends the Price Control Act so as to require that in the case of certain cash-on-delivery sales, increases in maximum prices shall be allowed to compensate for increases in postal rates or charges. The Senate adopted this amendment, which was offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. It was agreed to in the conference.

Section 5 of the conference agreement is a modification of the House provision known as the Andresen amendment. This section amends section 3 (e) of the Price Control Act, which now provides that no action shall be taken under that act with respect to any agricultural commodity without the prior approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I should like to finish what I am now speaking of and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER, I wanted to speak about the section to which the Senator is now referring

is now referring.

Mr. WAGNER. I have not yet finished my explanation of that section.

Perhaps I should finish it before I yield.

As agreed to in conference, this provision, which now applies only to unprocessed agricultural commodities, is

extended so as to require the prior approval of the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of actions taken under the Price Control Act affecting the prices received by processors for food or feed products derived from agricultural commodities. The amendment expressly requires that the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture in these cases be given in writing. The amendment does not make any change in existing law with respect to procedures for settling differences between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Price Administrator and for coordinating their actions with the stabilization program as a whole.

I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wanted to point out that considerable concern has been expressed regarding the fisheries not being taken care of. I think it is true that it probably was not parliamentarily possible for the conferees to consider that subject, but I simply wanted to serve notice that if it shall appear that the fisheries industry is entitled to similar consideration that we may at least be assured of a sympathetic hearing and possibly consideration of an amendment which may be proposed, not in connection with this report, but subsequently to the committee.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator from Maryland dealt with that subject, and will make reply to the Senator.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I can inform the Senator from Maine that as a conferee I took up the matter of the fish industry with the other conferees, and we explored and discussed it quite fully in conference. The Senator from Maine was quite correct in saying that for various reasons-and I will not take the time of the Senate to explain them now-it was considered not really suitable or even possible from a parliamentary standpoint to provide for the insertion of such a provision in the conference agreement. I regret it could not be provided for at that time. I heartily desire to see the substance of a plan such as the Senator has just suggested, and which was discussed from many angles at considerable length in coference, carried into successful operation.

Mr. BREWSTER. I may say that today I submitted a proposed amendment, which will go to the committee, and I hope there may be opportunity for its consideration at an early date.

Mr. WAGNER. I may say to the Senator that we discussed his proposal, and we were all in sympathy with it, but there was a situation which we could not control in conference.

Mr. BREWSTER. I very much appreciate the Senator's consideration.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, some concern has been expressed about the possibility that the amendment made by this section would impose too great an administrative burden upon the Secretary of Agriculture by requiring him to approve every single individual pricing order with respect to any processed food commodity. However, the Secretary can reduce this administrative burden to the extent that he deems desirable by giving general advance approval to individual or area pricing orders which are issued pur-

suant to and in accordance with a general pricing regulation. Furthermore, the section expressly provides that the Secretary's approval is not required in the case of individual adjustment orders which increase maximum prices.

Section 6 of the conference agreement amends subsection (e) of section 204 of the Emergency Price Control Act. This subsection now provides that in any enforcement proceeding brought pursuant to section 205 of the Price Control Act, the defendant may obtain leave to institute a special proceeding to test the validity of the regulation or order he is alleged to have violated, and also provides for a stay of the enforcement action during the pendency of the special proceeding testing the validity of such regulation or order. However, the subsection now applies only in the case of actions brought under section 205 where an actual violation of a regulation or order is alleged. It does not apply in cases where the action is brought under the general conspiracy statute, section 37 of the Criminal Code, and the offense charged is conspiring to violate a regulation or order issued under the Price Control Act.

The effect of the present amendment is to extend the application of this subsection to prosecutions for conspiracy to violate price-control regulations or orders, so that the defendants in such cases will have an opportunity to test the validity of the regulations or orders which they are charged with having conspired to violate, just as defendants in cases under section 205 are given an opportunity to test the validity of the regulations or orders which they are charged with actually having violated.

Section 7 of the conference agreement is the same as the Senate provision known as the Barkley amendment, and corresponds to the House provision known as the Bates amendment. This section amends the existing law so as to require that the maximum prices applicable to the meat processing industry must allow a reasonable margin of profit to the industry as a group from the processing of each of the three major species of meat animals, cattle and calves, hogs, and lambs and sheep, the profits from the processing of each such species being considered separately.

The Senate will remember that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Barkley] offered that amendment, and it was agreed to by a divided vote. The House placed a similar provision in the bill, so the question was considered in both Houses.

Section 8 of the conference agreement is the House provision known as the Patman amendment. The purpose of this section is to provide for the greater utilization of the facilities of meat slaughterers whose plants are not federally inspected, but are nevertheless operated under proper and sanitary conditions. The meat produced by these slaughterers cannot, under the prosent law, be shipped across State lines and is not purchased by the armed-forces. Consequently, quotas have been placed upon these slaughterers limiting the number of animals they may slaughter, in an effort

to channel the flow of more meat away from these slaughterers and to the federally inspected slaughterers whose products could be utilized by the armed forces and could also be shipped in interstate commerce to the large centers of popula-

This section of the conference agreement will prevent the imposition of quotas on these nonfederally inspected slaughtering plants, subject to the following conditions:

First. The Secretary of Agriculture must certify that the slaughtering plant is operated under sanitary conditions and that the meat produced therein is clean, wholesome, and suitable for human consumption.

Second. The slaughtering plants must make available to the armed services, or other Government purchase, such percentage of their production as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary or advisable.

Third. The Secretary of Agriculture must be satisfied that the meat produced in these slaughtering plants will be disposed of in legitimate trade channels in accordance with law.

The section also provides that meat which is produced in this plants, if it is clean, wholesome, and suitable for human consumption may be shipped in interstate commerce even thought it has not been inspected under the Federal Meat Inspection Act.

While this section involves some relaxation of the requirements heretofore prevailing with respect to the shipment of meat in interstate commerce, is seems justified as an emergency measure which offers some hope of aiding materially in relieving present meat shortages.

Those are the provisions which have been discussed. I ask that the conference report be agreed to.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I heard several Senators say "Vote!" I should like to say that I did not object to the consideration of the conference report. I feel that the only thing we should do at this late hour is to attempt to pass the appropriation bills, and also extend the Price Control Act. However, inasmuch as I was deeply interested in an amendment which affects the Middle West, and especially the livestock producers. I feel that it ought to be explained to Members of the Senate that the bill is coming back for our approval without the so-called Wherry amendment being adopted by the conferees.

There was not very much said about the Wherry amendment when it was agreed to by the Senate by a vote of 37 to 32. I feel that the amendment did not have the consideration by the conferees that it should have had, in attempting to get maximum production of livestock, meat, and agricultural products.

I suppose we should not attempt to block this legislation, or even ask for a record vote on the adoption of the conference report; but I feel that I and other Senators who supported this amendment should have a right at least to object that the conferees came back without the Wherry amendment.

To my knowledge there was only 1 vote on the Wherry amendment in the conference. The Senate conferees did not fight for the amendment as they should have fought for it, whether they agreed with it or not. The Senate adopted it. I understand that the Senator who made the motion to delete the Wherry amendment from the bill is on this side of the

The Wherry amendment was a good amendment. There was talk to the effect that it would raise prices, and that it was dangerous and inflationary. That was only a part of the pressure brought to defeat it.

What would the Wherry amendment do? It would simply make it unlawful to establish or maintain, against the producers of any livestock, grain, or any other agricultural commodity, a maximum price for such commodity which does not equal all costs and expenses, including all overhead expenses, a return on capital and an allowance for the labor of the producer and his family incurred in the production of such commodity, plus a reasonable profit thereon. amendment simply means that no Government agency or administrator would be permitted to place an unlawful price on the production of meat, that is, a price which would not reflect to the industry a reasonable profit. An unlawful price would be contested by great segments of the industry. Probably the cattle feeders in a group would contest an unlawful price in the production of meat. Mr. President, the reason why we do not have meat today, and the reason why we shall not have meat 6 months from now, is that there is nothing in the provisions of the present OPA Act, or in the bill as it comes from conference, which would induce one cattle feeder to put another head of cattle or hogs in his feed lot.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the distinguished Senator whether it is not true that industry refused to go ahead when the war started until it was assured of costplus contracts. Is not that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. I will answer the Sen-ator in this way: It is my understanding that industry does operate on the cost-plus system of doing business, and that industry throughout all sections of the country receives a guarantee.

Mr. LANGER. Labor has also received its increase, has it not?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the forgotten man in this entire war, so far as being guaranteed a profit is concerned, has been the farmer raising livestock and grain?

Mr. WHERRY. I think there is no doubt about it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. It is my recollection that a few weeks ago I heard the Senator from North Dakota say that North Dakota was the richest State in the United States per capita, and that the farmers of North Dakota had never been so prosperous. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is absolutely true. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me so that I may reply to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield. Mr. LANGER. That is absolutely true. I will tell the Senator why it is true, inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from Ohio has mentioned it. It is true for the reason that Almighty God has been giving us crops for 5 years. Prior to that time, for nearly 10 years, we did business at a tremendous loss in North Dakota.. The result was that 21 percent of our population left the State, and the majority were broke. We want to get those people back to North Dakota. They went to California, Oregon, and the State of Washington.

The result is that the population of our State is 21.6 percent less than it previously was. Our people are the richest people of the United States, per capita, according to bank deposits. have no way of knowing what will happen this year or next year, and no one knows that better than the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], because in the last war his boss, Mr. Herbert Hoover, entered the picture when our wheat got up to about \$3.50 a bushel. It was the distinguished Mr. Herbert Hoover who sent his representative, the now distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, to North Dakota; and, believe it or not, we were the only industry in World War I which had to take a reduction. They reduced the price of wheat to \$2.26 a bushel. They did not reduce the price of cotton; they did not reduce the prices received by any other industry anywhere in the United States; but they made the farmers in North Dakota and elsewhere in the Northwest take \$2.26 a bushel for wheat. The farm machinery which the farmers had to buy went up and up and up in price. Finally, when the war was over, the index for farm machinery was 198. Mind you, Mr. President, when the war was over the prices paid for the products of the farming industry went down and down, but from the time when World War ended, 27 years ago now, the price of farm machinery has been going up and up and up. One reason why we have the largest bank deposits per capita in the United States is that the farmers in the Northwest have not been able to purchase farm machinery. Day after day after day I have put into the Con-GRESSIONAL RECORD statements showing that the farmers in North Dakota and elsewhere throughout the Northwest have been unable to purchase farm machinery. Some of our farmers have farm machinery which is 25 or 30 years old. They have tried to replace it, but they have been unable to do so. The result is that ther are still using the old machinery, with the result that in one county, Hettinger County, in 1943, the farmers lost, according to the sworn testimony of the county agent, \$1,000,000 in wheat which they were not able to harvest.

That is the situation there. It is true that we have some money in the bank now; but certainly we are entitled, just as the distinguished Senator from Nebraska said the other day, to have the feed lots filled; we are entitled to have the cattle fattened, and the farmers are entitled to a price which at least, as the amendment provides, would cover the cost of production, plus a reasonable The farmers have not been getting that, so far as cattle are concerned and so far as hogs are concerned. No one knows better than the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that last year we gave hogs away. One farmer came to Washington to tell us about 200 hogs he had in North Dakota. He said he could not sell them, and he wanted to know what to do with them. I told him to put them in a railroad car and ship them to the President of the United States, and make a gift of them to him. One Member of the Senate had 80 hogs in Virginia, weighing 80 pounds apiece. At that time barley was selling at \$1.05 in Virginia, as I understand. He did not even fatten them; I understand he gave them away.

All the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska asks for is that the farmer shall receive the cost of production, plus a reasonable profit. I certainly wish to go on record as saying that the Senate conferees should have put up a battle to see that the farmers would receive a price which would return to them the cost of production plus a rea-

sonable profit.

WHERRY. Mr. President, I Mr. thank the Senator from North Dakota for his contribution and his very timely statement. I think it answers the question asked by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]; but if it does not answer it, I should like to read from the RECORD of June 11, at page 5866, a letter which the distinguished majority leader placed in the RECORD. The letter was sent by the Office of Price Administration to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. I wish to read only the first paragraph of the letter. This is what Chester Bowles, head of the Office of Price Administration, wrote to the Senator from Oklahoma:

Recognizing the critical shortage of meat and the imperative need of avoiding any impediment to maximum production and even distribution, this Office, in addition to sat-isfying all the various mandatory requirements of the present law, will see products of each of the three main groups of livestock-cattle and calves, hogs, and lambs and sheep—are each, separately considered, on a profitable basis.

The Office of Price Administration recognizes that there is a scarcity of meat. I think it is silly for Members of the Senate to continue to stand on this floor and say there is plenty of meat and that the farmers are making all kinds of money. If today the farmers were making money the feed lots would be filled with cattle. and there would be meat on the meat counters. But everyone knows that the reverse is actually the fact.

Most of the meat that is being sold is being sold on the black market. No one will deny that. I sat on the special committee with the Senator from Oklahoma and reams of testimony were taken. about black-market operations throughout the entire country, and the situation is getting worse and worse. I tell you, Mr. President, the food situation in this country is a real threat.

Now the Office of Price Administration recognizes that fact. It is in the record. The Office of Price Administration says that the meat situation is critical. It is critical, Mr. President. The only way in the world we are going to obtain maximum production of meatand I have said this to the distinguished chairman of the committee, for whom I have the highest respect-is to make sure that more cattle and hogs are raised and fattened. If we do that, we will have more meat. If we do not do it, we will not get the meat we need.

The pending OPA legislation will not increase meat production to the extent of one steer in the feed lots. There is not a provision in the conference report which promises the farmer anything.

There was some talk to the effect that the farm organizations were against my amendment, and the press and Ed O'Neal and the Farmers Union were said to be against it. I agree that some of the eastern newspapers disagreed with my amendment, and they had a perfect right to do so; but I tell you, Mr. President, that in the section of the country from which I come there has been unanimous support behind my amendment. The farmers in that section understand the Wherry language and the Wherry amendment. They may not understand parity or base prices or the language which comes from the House of Representatives relative to section 5. I think it would take a Philadelphia lawyer to understand that. The farmers in my section cannot understand it, but they do understand that they should be paid fair wages and a decent profit for the labor they put into feeding cattle.

I hold in my hand an editorial which appeared in the Columbus Daily Telegram. I read it because the Columbus Telegram is published in the heart of one of the finest cattle-feeding sections in my State. I refer to the Columbus Telegram for another reason. The editor is the distinguished Edgar Howard, one of the most famous Democrats Nebraska has ever produced. For many years he served in the House of Representatives. Now he is a writer of editorials. He backed the Democratic administration during the lifetime of President Roosevelt, and today he backs the Truman administration. He believed in the late President Roosevelt, and today he believes in President Truman. The editorial reads as follows:

Senator WHERRY thinks the American farmer is just as much entitled to a cost-plus price for his farm produce as the manufacture who makes things for the Army or the Accordingly Senator WHERRY has offered and secured favorable action on an amendment to a Senate bill looking to that end. Why not cost plus for the farmer in providing farm products for prosecution of

I ask the Members of the Senate, "Why not?"

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. What is the Senator's understanding from his study of

the black market which he has made. as to whether or not the prices received in the black market should result in a return to the farmer of the cost of production plus a fair prefit?

Mr. WHERRY. If the farmer could receive prices for which meat is being sold in the black market, there would be all kinds of cattle in the feed lot.

Mr. BREWSTER. The reason I ask the question is that I recall reading the report of the mayor of New York covering a very careful survey of conditions existing in New York City. In the report the mayor stated, I believe, that from 75 to 80 percent of all the meat moving into New York City was black-market meat.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. So the consumers of New York are paying the extra price.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. The main difficulty is that illegal dealers, instead of honest dealers, receive the money.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. Mr. BREWSTER. I assume that the committees which have considered this matter thought that there was no way to avoid the conditions about which there has been so much complaint. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the committee from the State of New York does not desire to encourage outrageous violations of the law, although the result is that, instead of the farmers in Nebraska and in Maine receiving the prices which they should be receiving, those who are willing to violate the law are the ones who are profiting by the illegal transactions.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his observations. He is absolutely

Mr. President, I have talked with the chairman of the committee, and I know that he is just as anxious as the rest of us are to make sure that meat is sold at legal prices. But when the product becomes scarcer and scarcer, it is exactly what the bootlegger of meat wants in his operations. He wants the product to be scarce. He wants the laws to be enforced so that the legitimate dealer is not allowed to obtain meat. The blackmarket operator buys the meat, takes his profit, and the producer does not receive a profit. At the same time the consumer is sometimes compelled to pay for what he receives as much as three times the legal price.

The testimony before the committee was that 90 percent of the meat going into New York City was black-market meat, and that some of it had cost \$1 a. pound.

The testimony with regard to eggs was that every legitimate dealer who purchased eggs was compelled to pay 10 cents a dozen as a black-market profit before they could be sold at the legal price. Yet, some Senators assert that the farmer is making a great deal of money and that he is getting rich. It is selfevident that if there was a large profit to be derived from feeding cattle there would be no difficulty today in obtaining meat. There are today in this country more than 10,000,000 surplus head of cattle, and there is plenty of corn with which to feed them. It is only because of the inability to make a reasonable profit that livestock is not being put into the feed lots. The Wherry amendment attempts to do in a legislative way, relative to the meat situation, what the administration should have done 2 years

Mr. President, permit me to continue further with the editorial. The editor asks, "Why not a cost-plus for the farmer in providing farm products for the prosecution of the war?" The editorial continues:

Sure the foods which the farmer produces cannot shoot the enemy. But a soldier without food in his belly would not shine as a marksman. There was quite an uproar in the Senate when Wherry put that amend-ment across. Oddly enough the big boys who love the farmer only for his vote had no trouble in bringing to their aid such "pro-fessional" farmers as President O'Neal, of the Farm Bureau, and President Patton, of the Farmers' Union. Both the "professionals" joined the "cost-plus" manufacturers in de-nouncing Wherry for trying to tie the American farmer in with the sure-thing profit which cost-plus guarantees to them. are on the right track, my Senator. Don't let them push you into the ditch.

Mr. President, the editorial from which I have been reading is from a newspaper which has been one of the strongest supporters of the present and prior administration in the Middle West. Its editor is a man of distinction, a statesman, and one whom the chairman of the committee has known for many years.

I will not burden the Senate at this late hour by reading the various editorials which I have before me. How-ever, here is one from the Omaha World Herald, formerly owned by the late Gilbert M. Hitchcock, one of the outstanding statesmen of all time. He was a product of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. as follows:

A GUARANTEED PROFIT?

"The farmer ought to be guaranteed his cost of production."

Out here in the midlands that was a political battlecry during the depression. Henry Wallace and the other thinkers who made policy in the heyday of the New Deal rushed about plowing under pigs and corn. The avowed aim was to raise prices to the point where the farmer would make a profit.

Just the other day, by one of those flukes which occasionally occur in Congress, Senator WHERRY managed to slip a "cost of produc-tion" amendment into the OPA extension bill.

When the members found out later what they had done, cries of alarm sounded throughout the Capitol. Republican Senator Taff thought the amendment was so ridiculous that nobody would pay any attention to it, and New Deal Senator Lucas admitted he didn't know what he was voting for until after he had approved the Wherry amendment.

But just how ridiculous is the Wherry amendment?

It provides that OPA cannot set a price ceiling for the farmer's products that does not equal his cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

Loosely worded perhaps. It may not be able to operate as written. The reasonable profit needs definition and someone is going to have to decide what the costs of production are.

Yet, isn't the principle consistent with what manufacturers, processors and distrib-utors have been demanding ever since price control went into effect?

Or look at it from the standpoint of war production. Many war plants holding Government contracts are guaranteed their costs and they are guaranteed profits based on costs. The farmer with his food production factory is not. He is subject to ficors and ceilings that fluctuate with the whims of Washington officialdom. These fluctuations cause uncertainty and confusion. They result in crops decreases, fewer pigs, fewer chickens, fewer cattle in the feedlots.

It is almost as if there were a conspiracy to hinder the farmer in making a profit. He is supposed to do it the hard way. Never is he allowed to plan for the full year of opera-tions ahead. Never is he told, "We need your products now, so go ahead and produce and the Government will take the risk and guarantee your profit."

Subsidies may change, prices may rise and fall before his products get to market, policies may switch in Washington, there may be gluts and famines. The farmer is certain only of uncertainty.

So Senator WHERRY proposes that farmers be guaranteed their costs and a profit. Maybe it won't work. But the proposal deserves no such ridicule and abuse as have been heaped upon it.

It is entirely consistent with the current policy of encouraging abundance, as outlined here this week by the man who is soon to be Secretary of Agriculture, Representative ANDERSON.

It is no more inflationary than any other variation of the cost-plus principle.

It is a way out of the wilderness of directives, the jungle of restrictions that bewilder and dismay the farmer. It may not be the best way, and the House of Representatives may kick it out of the OPA bill, but Senator WHERRY has suggested a solution and it is far from ridiculous.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it has been said that professional farmers are against the Wherry amendment. I have received approximately 150 telegrams from farm organizations. The telegrams have not come merely from individual farmers. I have before me a telegram from the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, the national organization of which Mr. O'Neal is president. The telegram is as follows:

LINCOLN, NEBR., June 14, 1945. Senator Kenneth S. Wherry, Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C. Please send complete copy of your amend-ment by wire to me at Fort Kearney Hotel,

Kearney, tomorrow. Send copy to Lincoln office. Your amendment appears to put agriculture in its right place.

HOWARD L. PETERSON,

Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation.

Let us also consider the National Grange. It has been said that the farm organizations are all against my amendment. That is not true. President Albert S. Goss is not against the principle of the Wherry amendment. He differs only with the mechanics of it. I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the president of the National Grange, Mr. Albert S. Goss,

be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. as follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE. Washington, D. C., June 19, 1945. Hon. Kenneth S. Wherry, Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C. My Dear Senator: I told you last week that I was in sympathy with the purpose you sought to attain in your amendment to the OPA bill, but that I did not think it would work, because it would so tie the hands of the Director that he would lose all control of food prices. We do not want to handicap him in his operations. We want to help him, and I am sure you have the same purpose. You asked if I could suggest any amendment which would meet our objection to the Wherry amendment and still accomplish your purpose. This I promised to try to do.

Our objection to your amendment lies in the fact that as worded, every farmer could claim the right to a ceiling to meet his individual costs, plus a profit, no matter how outlandish those costs might be, and the whole operation of OPA, so far as it pertained to food, could be tied up in the courts and become useless.

We believe no ceilings should be set which would yield returns below a fair and equitable price, and that such a price should include production costs of the reasonably efficient farmer under reasonably favorable produc-tion conditions. We believe it is right to figure on a return on the farmers' investment plus a reasonable wage for his labor and that of his family, but if these items are fairly considered, we doubt the equity of adding an additional profit. Some may differ with this view, but we have held that a reasonable return on the investment plus compensation for services is all that should be expected during such an emergency, whether it relates to agriculture or any other industry. However, we do not consider this a major issue one way or the other.

In our judgment some one must be charged with the responsibility of determining what is "cost" under reasonably efficient farming practices and reasonably favorable produc-tion conditions. I think this is the job of the Secretary of Agriculture. I believe it is the responsibility of the Congress to lay down the policies, that, is to tell the OPA how Congress wants to see the job done, and then insist on their doing it.

I am perfectly aware that in some instances the OPA has not carried out the intent of Congress, expressed in Section 3 of Public Law 729, Seventy-seventh Congress (October 2, 1942), which ordered that ceilings be modified where necessary "to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes" or where the ceilings would "not reflect such increased cost." If Congress feels that the law is not being obeyed, one way to get compliance is to cut off appropriations. I don't think the remedy is to amend the law so as to make it unworkable. Neither do I think it possible to spell out complete instructions for the thousands of kinds of cases which are constantly arising.

As you know we are greatly concerned over the failure of the OPA to recognize the need to maintain and increase production as the basic remedy for inflation. We have recommended to the Banking and Currency Committee of the House that there be incorporated in the bill a statement of basic policy so clear that it could not be misunderstood, yet so general that there would be plenty of elbow room for operation, then tell the OPA that Congress means business. We feel that the emphasis in this inflation fight must be shifted from the punitive type of control to increasing production. We even suggested wording which we felt would do the job. If we continue to pursue policies which retard production and distribution, we feel that we are headed for plenty of trouble. placing the emphasis on production and believe it should apply to all industry includ-ing agriculture. We would prefer this to singling out agriculture and giving it special treatment. If you feel that, because agriculture has been signaled out as the principal spot for holding the line some special legis-lation is needed to compel compliance with the intent and purpose of the Congress, I suggest that you give consideration to an amended Wherry amendment about as follows

"It shall be unlawful to establish or maintain a maximum price on any agricultural commodity, or on any commodity processed or made in whole or substantial part there-from, which is insufficient to return to the producers a fair and equitable price therefor. As used herein a fair and equitable price shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture after due hearings and investigation and shall be one which will yield to the reasonably efficient producer, under reasonably favorable production conditions, a re-turn sufficient to meet all production costs including overhead expenses, a return on the investment, and an allowance for the labor of the producer and his family.

I believe such an amendment could be administered, and would probably attain the results you seek.

We are vigorously opposed to passing the measure extending the life of the OPA without amendment, for we believe such action would be considered by the OPA as an endorsement of everything they have done. While they have held inflation well in check in some lines, for which they are to be commended, in other lines, shortages, inferior goods, and black markets have brought very substantial inflation upon us which does not show in the index of living costs. This is largely due to a mistaken policy of ignoring the producer and the actual living conditions in the field, and building a policy around a cost-of-living index which is largely meaningless under present conditions.

We believe the time has come for the Congress to make it amply clear that it expects a changed course in the matter of encouraging production and protecting producers. I don't believe your amendprotecting ment, even modified as I have suggested, is broad enough to do the job alone. I also feel that reasonable and sensible controls are more needed than ever before, so the Congress should not tie the director's hands, but should give him very definite marching orders and see that he follows them. Congress should not make his job tougher. It should help him to do what has to be done if we are to avoid trouble.

Yours truly, A. S. Goss. Master, the National Grange.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I invite attention to one paragraph of the The writer implies, in effect, letter. that if the mechanics of the Wherry amendment were modified he would go along with it. He suggests a modification which he had no way of getting before the conferees.

I asked Mr. Goss to present it to them. I do not know what happened. He has said that he agrees in principle with the amendment.

I have before me a copy of the Western Nebraska Observer. I will not put these various articles in the RECORD, but I assert that almost all the farm organizations are in favor of the amendment 100 percent. It is true that some of them want a modification of the amendment, and that would be perfectly agreeable to me. If the conferees had wished to consider anything of that kind, maximum production might be attained. However, it will not be attained under the provisions of the conference report bill.

Let us consider the cotton growers. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to the fact that no Member of the Senate worked harder than did I in order to assure that the cotton growers of the South would receive parity, and a profit on what they produced. I do not know whether the last paragraph on page 9 of the report was brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The report to which the Senator has referred is a report of the House conferees. The Senate conferees never agreed to it.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that they have agreed, and the Senator has a letter in his pocket which contains

Mr. TAFT. No: I think the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will read into the RECORD what I have before me. I may have to withdraw my statement that both the Senate and the House agreed. I know the Senator from Alabama agreed, and he is the person who tells the conferees what should be done about cotton. I read:

The conferees have given consideration to the operation of the Bankhead-Brown amendment to the Stabilization Act of 1942 relating to the pricing of cotton textiles.

With that, I want the distinguished Senator from Alabama to know that I absolutely agree. Attention should have been paid to it. The cotton growers should receive a profit just as every other farmer should receive a profit on the commodities which he produces. I am just as much in sympathy with seeing that they get a profit as that any other farmer in the United States shall get a profit, and I have acted in accordance with that idea.

The conferees are in agreement with the conclusion of the Senate and House committees, that the purpose of that amendment will not be carried out.

I want the Senators to get this-

Unless the maximum price for each major cotton textile item is fixed and maintained at not less than the sum of the following:

1. The cotton cost (which must be computed at not less than the landed mill parity equivalent for the grade and staple of cotton used; except that, after the initial adjustments required under the amendment have been made, the amendment does not require the continued use of cotton cost figure which is, and for a representative period has been, above or below the actual cotton cost):

2. A weighted average of mill conversion costs; and-

That permits the textile operator to operate at a profit, so that he does not take it out of the farmer-

3. A reasonable profit.

The conferees are advised that the Price Administrator has informed the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that the policy which he intends to follow in administering the amendment will be in full accord with this opinion as to its requirements.

What does that mean? It means that there has been a definite understanding by the conferees on the part of the House and the Senator from Alabama that from here on, even though they have done to the cotton farmers just what they have done to the cattle producers, they are going to see that he is paid on the three bases I have mentioned.

I ask, if it can be done for the cotton farmer, why can it not be done for the beef producers, the sheep producers, the producers of hogs? Why cannot the processor be paid such a price so that when he buys the farmer's cattle and hogs and sheep he can sell them at a price which will reflect a profit to those who feed?

It is said that it is impossible to make the Wherry amendment workable.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield. Mr. GURNEY. Has the Senator from Nebraska, who has done such a magnificent job in explaining the situation of the farmers regarding the feeding of livestock, considered the idea of asking for a further conference? Certainly, with the backing of the majority of the Senators who voted to adopt the Wherry amendment, we are entitled not merely to good efforts, but to excellent efforts on the part of our conferees and those of the House

Mr. WHERRY. As I stated in the beginning, I desire to be constructive in the United States Senate; I do not wish to injure the chances of the passage of any bill. I realize that the hour is late. I should like very much to have the conferees go back and reconsider the Wherry amendment, or a modification of it, and I am about to offer a modification of it. if they would take it back. But, because of the lateness of the hour and the fact that three or four appropriation bills are yet to be disposed of, I did not wish to be in the position of standing in the way of their passage.

Mr. GURNEY. If I may suggest to the Senator, a couple of days of the month of June still remain in the present fiscal year, and so far as I know, the people of our section do not feel too happy about the treatment they have received under OPA for the past 2 years.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. Mr. GURNEY. Certainly the farming interests of the country would welcome at least another chance for their "white alley" in this magnificent effort on the Senator's part

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota for his contribution. I want the committee to know, and I want the distinguished chairman to know-because I think we are all trying to accomplish the same thing, but we are not getting anywhere with the proposed legislation—that there is going to be a serious meat shortage. Oh, yes; there will be a seasonal run of grass-fed cattle in the next few months, but the grass-fed cattle are not the ones we want in A and AA and B, and my colleague the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], a

feeder of long standing, knows that to be so. He knows that a little later the cattle on the feed lot will be the best supply.

Mr. President, this is a serious matter. I have discussed it on the Senate floor, and I hope I have not worn out my welcome. The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] said that every time beef was mentioned I saw red. I regret that. I have tried my level best to be constructive, and to offer advice to the administration, to help them bring about production of meat.

Senators may talk about enforcement legislation, they may talk about everything there is in the bill, but there is nothing that will enable me to go to the farmer in Nebraska and say, "Come on; put your cattle in the feed lot." There is not a thing in the bill that is going to

change the situation.

Some may say, "Oh, yes; Mr. Anderson is about to become the head of the Department of Agriculture." Mr. President, I do not know Mr. Anderson's history. It is said he is a very fine gentle-But I cannot go to Nebraska and say, "Yes; put your cattle in the feed lot. We have a new Secretary of Agriculture." If the farmers there judge the future by the past, they are going to think of the violations of ceilings, they are going to think about the hogs they lost money on in 1943 and 1944, they are going to think about the times when parity was not even maintained in the sale of their livestock. We have to bring about production of meat. That is the only solution of the problem.

Mr. President, this one-man administration is all right, but I should like to call the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee to the fact that this is not a new thing. Away back in May 1944, 24 Senators joined in offering a resolution, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

It is Senate Resolution 309.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with a view to determining-

 the conditions prevailing in the production, processing, distribution, and marketing of livestock, livestock feed, poultry, eggs, milk, and the products thereof;

(2) the effects of regulations, orders, and directives issued by governmental agencies upon the production, processing, marketing, distribution, and supplies of such com-

(3) any practices wherein processors and distributors of such commodities are circumventing the purposes and objectives of price floors, price ceilings, and subsidies at the expense of the producers and the Public Treasury;

(4) reasons for the failures to support prices to producers as required by existing

law;

(5) alleged adverse effects of maladjustments in maximum prices established on different grades of meat and particularly the extent to which livestock feeders have been penalized because of an inadequate allowance on the better grades of meat to encourage the feeding of livestock;

(6) alleged adverse effects upon the livestock, poultry, and dairy industries of the price and other policies relative to corn and other feed grains and the maladjustments resulting therefrom;

Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advis-The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we offered the resolution asking for an investigation of the entire meat situation. from the producer to the feeder, to the nonprocessor and the processor, on through to the distributor and the consumer. One of the things we asked for was a consolidation and to have a oneman food administrator. If there was any advantage in having a one-man food administrator, certainly that was the time to authorize it.

I feel that if we can have one man in charge of prices, without interference from above, so that he can set the producers' level, the feeders' level, and go through to the consumer, that is the way to handle the meat situation; and if that can be done, and he has unrestricted authority, we can straighten out price levels. But every time I have tried to bring that about, the War Food Administrator, or the OPA, or some other agency was overruled by the Price Stabilizer, and we went right back to where we started.

Mr. President, we submitted a similar resolution again this year, Resolution 96, and it met the same fate. By the way, the first resolution was adopted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry unanimously, but was held up in the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and never got out of that committee. Resolution 96 was offered and went to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. and the committee adopted a resolution offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Thomas]. They voted for a food investigation, and a great deal of valuable information we have received came from the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which the Senator from Oklahoma did such magnificent work in gathering data to show the administration the exact situation relative to meat.

But the proposal for a one-man administration is not something new, that is, not something that can be carried by the press and have the feeders say, "Yes;

we have a one-man Food Administrator, now we will put cattle in the feed lot." It will not get one more steer in the feed lot. But I am hopeful that if this oneman Food Administrator goes into office, he will go in without restriction.

If I read section 5 of the report correctly, I think all in the world the conferees have done is to reenact the present law, which possibly will require the President to issue directives to his price stabilizer, giving authority to override or veto anything the Secretary of Agriculture might do. In other words, the only one who can do anything in the meat situation will be the President himself.

One more thing, and then I shall be through. I have a modification to the Wherry amendment which I should like to read, if the conferees feel they cannot accept the Wherry amendment because it is too broad. The Wherry amendment as it was originally adopted by the Senate goes through the production of all agricultural commodities. If for any reason the conferees of the Senate and the conferees of the House feel that that should not be adopted, that it is too broad, then I am asking the Senate conferees, if the conference report is not agreed to and there is a further conference, to take this modification, with the instruction, if possible, that they stand by the Wherry amendment, but if that can not possibly be carried, then modify it to the extent that it shall apply only to the feeding of livestock, cattle, calves, sheep, and hogs, provided for by the processor under the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, I said in the beginning that I thought I would not ask for a vote on the question of disagreeing to the conference report, because of the lateness of the hour, but since I began speaking several Senators have said to me that they would like to be recorded on this question. I do not want the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to think that I would violate any implied agreement I may have made. When I rose to my feet I did not intend to make a motion to disagree, by reason of the lateness of the hour, but I think a vote could be had quickly now.

I should like to move now that the Senate disagree to the conference report, and ask for a further conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Chair will state to the Senator from Nebraska that the question is on agreeing

to the conference report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the conference report should be agreed to. I have sympathy for much of what the Senator from Nebraska has said. I agree fully that the bill does not cure the meat trouble, and it does not cure any of the problems of the OPA. In my opinion, the OPA is rapidly running into a complete failure. But I do not think that has anything to do with the conference report.

In the first place, so far as the Wherry amendment is concerned, every single conferee on the part of the House said that under no circumstances would he ever agree to it. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Nebraska and I voted for it to the last.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I wish to interrupt the Senator now for the reason that the Senator just made the statement that the OPA was rapidly running into a position where it would not be effective at all. I want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Appropriations Committee is now being asked to appropriate \$191,000,000 to keep OPA in being for the coming year. So if OPA is not going to be effective, that is quite a large amount of money to pay for a dead horse.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. I do not think that money is going to help the OPA. I do not think people can be forced to comply. I think there will be the same break-down in respect to OPA as there was in respect to prohibition. In connection with prohibition there was also demand after demand for stricter enforcement, to put people in jail. The difficulty with OPA is that its regulations are too stringent and unreasonable. I presented that argument to the Senate with all the strength I could; but I was defeated in the Senate. The Senate thought I was mistaken on that question.

So far as the Wherry amendment is concerned, the objection raised to it was that we have based all price control, so far as farmers are concerned, on parity. It was said the farmers do not know what parity is, but the list is published every day. Under the operations of the parity system there has been in the past 2 years an automatic increase of about 12 percent in the price of farm products under that control, whereas there has been no change in the price of retail products, or a change of only 1 or 2 percent. So, many farmers prefer the parity system.

Furthermore, if we change now, without a great deal of reconsideration, and put the whole thing on a cost-of-production basis for the farmer, it will require a complete reorganization of the whole pricing system. Some farmers get more on the parity basis apparently, and some get more on the cost-of-production basis. It is not easy to make that change overnight. I think it may be that the whole thing should be considered by the Sen-Perhaps the cost-of-production basis is a better basis than the parity basis; but to change the whole price control system by shifting in that way seems to me to be an unreasonable thing to do and a very difficult thing to do.

The Senator from Nebraska is really not concerned about the farmer. His problem is the same problem I presented to the Senate for the packers and also for all the manufacturers in the country. He is concerned with the feeder, who really is a processor. So far as I know there is today no complaint-I do not think there is-over the price of range cattle. The charge is that the OPA does not allow sufficient margin for the feeder. I do not think OPA does allow a sufficient margin. I do not think OPA allows enough for the processor in many industries, and I tried to get that situation changed, but was unsuccessful.

The manufacturer does not obtain any cost-plus. I cited many cases of processors and manufacturers on the floor of the Senate selling their products at a loss today, as the feeder does. I think the theory now in operation is a mistaken one, but the Senate voted down my pro-

The Wherry amendment is not confined simply to feeders. It affects every farm product. There are hundreds of farm products throughout the United States, and the amendment would change the basis on which prices are controlled.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator vield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot go along with the Senator's argument that I am attempting to change the measuring stick by which the price control of agricultural products is based on parity. The amendment simply provides that if parity does not reflect a profit, or if the base period basis does not reflect a profit. then it is mandatory upon whoever is responsible—the Price Administrator to set a price that will reflect a profit. If parity will do it, very well. If the base period basis will do it, very well. But if neither reflects a profit to the producer of livestock or grains, then I think the only way we are going to obtain maximum production is to straighten the price level. By my amendment I do not supplant the parity base nor the base period basis as a measuring stick. My amendment would simply supplement the methods so in the event a profit is not made, the level will be straightened out so the price will be profitable.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if processors are assured a profit I think the feeders of cattle should be allowed a profit. But the Senate voted down that principle. I do not think this bill does anything substantial. But that is not due to any action of the conferees. It is because the Senate voted down any substantial change. The amendments adopted in the House, while touted rather highly, I do not think made a substantial change in the OPA operations. However, I cannot see how, by going back to conference, we can obtain anything. We are not going to get the House to accept the Wherry amendment, at least not with the present House members of the conference committee. We could not get one of them to begin even to consider adopting the Wherry amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that the proposition was made by the Senate conferees that if they took out the the Wherry amendment, the House conferees would take out the Andresen amendment. Am I correct, I will ask the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. After a long discussion of the amendments, the motion was made by a Member of the Senate that the Senate recede on the Wherry amendment and that the House recede on the Dirksen amendment. I voted against that motion, but it was carried by a majority of the Senate conferees. We could have stayed there until doomsday, in my opinion, and the House Members would never have agreed to the Wherry amendment.

That developed from the discussion that took place, and the argument made against it that I have described.

Mr. President, I do not think the conference bill does anything except to continue the same old OPA, and I think we are going to have the same trouble that we have always had with the OPA.

I agreed with the Senator from Nebraska. But the whole trouble lies in the fact that neither the House nor the Senate adopted an amendment which really went to the heart of the trouble, dealing with the fixing of prices and the processing of food and the feeding of cattle, if you please.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield. Mr. BARKLEY. I do not care to reveal any confidential discussions that took place in the conference committee, any of the give-and-take that always takes place in such discussions, but one of the first things the Senate conferees did after a reasonable discussion of the amendments of the House and the Wherry amendment, and the Wiley amendment which was put on the bill in connection with cash on deliveries and so forth, was to state to the House conferees that we insisted on the Wherry amend-

The Senator knows what my attitude was with respect to his amendment. I do not wish to deceive him or anyone else. I doubted the wisdom of it at the time, and I thought if it had been discussed it probably would not have been included in the bill. But it was included. and we took the position that we were for the Wherry amendment. If I recall my own language, I believe I said that we were standing by the Wherry amendment. After 2 or 3 days of full discussion, morning and afternoon, it became obvious that the House would not yield in its opposition to the Wherry amendment. Not a single one of the House conferees would agree to it under any circumstances. We had to come to an understanding. Finally a motion was made. I think probably I made the suggestion that if the House would yield on the Dirksen amendment and also on the Andresen amendment with a modified amendment as a substitute, the Senate would recede on the Wherry amendment. It was on that basis that we obtained an agreement. We would have been in session until now if we had not yielded on that amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Was there any indication that the House might accept the Wherry idea for livestock only? that question considered by the House?

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator mean for the feeding of livestock?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. That was not suggested. Mr. GURNEY. I mean the cost of production for livestock only, as has been suggested by the junior Senator from Nebraska as a modification of the original Wherry amendment.
Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator mean

for the feeding of cattle only. Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. That never was suggested. There is no objection that I know of to the price of range cattle. In fact, as I understand, the cost of production of range cattle is well below the present price. The question is whether the margin for the feeder is enough. That has been the whole objection of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. GURNEY. May I ask if the con-

ferees considered the idea?

Mr. TAFT. No; the conferees did not consider confining it to feeder cattle, because that suggestion was not made. Such a suggestion has never been made until today. I just made it. I thought of it myself.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if he did not hear the Senator from Nebraska make the suggestion of a modified Wherry amendment. That was before the Senator from Ohio took the floor.

Mr. TAFT. It would belong in the Barkley amendment, if it went anywhere. Let me read the Barkley amendment:

Provided further, That on and after the date of the enactment of this proviso, no maximum prices shall be established maintained on products resulting from the processing of cattle and calves, lambs and sheep, and hogs, the processing of each species being separately considered, which, taken together, do not allow for a reasonable margin of profit to the processing industry as a group on each such species.'

I suppose it could almost be said that the feeder is a processor, but I do not suppose it would be so held.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no subsidy given to the processor. There is only one subsidy being paid to the feeder. and that is 50 cents a hundred. On a 1,000-pound steer that is \$5. I think there is no dispute about that. If we can get down to business and consider this question constructively, I should like to suggest to the conferees the following amendment:

That no maximum prices shall be established or maintained on cattle and calves, lambs and sheep, and hogs, or on products resulting from the processing thereof, each species being separately considered, which taken together, do not allow for a reasonable margin of profit to the livestock feeding industry as a group on each such species.

That is in almost the identical language of the Barkley amendment, and would do the same thing for the feeder of livestock as I thought the original Wherry amendment would do. It would do the same thing for the feeder of livestock as is done for the processor under the Barkley amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Barkley amendment was not in conference. It would have been in order, when that amendment was pending here, to have offered the amendment now suggested by the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I know that. Mr. BARKLEY. But it was not offered. The House adopted a provision identical in language with the Barkley amendment, so it was not even in conference. We could not have changed a word in it if we had desired to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. The language was changed when various amendments in the bill were modified.

Mr. BARKLEY. We did not change the language of any amendment which was in both bills in identical terms.

Mr. WHERRY. That may be true. Mr. BARKLEY. We changed the l We changed the language of the so-called Andresen amendment, which was in conference. I may say that the House conferees felt that they could not yield entirely on the Andresen amendment, and that they ought not to be asked to go back with it entirely stricken out, and we modified it by agreeing to a substitute which reenacted the Bankhead amendment. which was adopted a year or two ago, and enlarging it to include all food products processed from agricultural products, and to give the Secretary of Agriculture the same right as to them which he had in the Bankhead amendment with respect to agricultural products.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate that, and

I think it is all right.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio further yield so that I may ask the distinguished majority leader a ques-

Mr. TAFT. I yield. Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader, in case there should be another conference. whether he would be faborable to a modification of the Wherry amendment in the language which I read, and whether he would try his level best as a conferee to see that we do the same thing for the cattle feeder that we are doing for the packer.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not in a position-

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking the Senator personally.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand; and I will answer the Senator personally. I am not in a position to make any statement which would encourage another conference. I think we have obtained the best conference report we can get. I think it would be a futile thing to reject this conference report and send the bill back to another conference, because after 3 days of the most intense discussion, when the question was thrashed out between conferees on the part of both Houses, we arrived at an agreement. We brought in men from the outside who were familiar with the prob-We did not always agree with them; but I think the Senator from Ohio is accurate when he states that, in view of the situation, we got the best conference report that was possible among these conferees. If new conferees were appointed, we might get something different, but I do not think there is any guarantee of it, and I doubt very much if new conferees would be appointed. In my judgment it would be a futile thing to reject this conference report. The result might be no law at all, because we have only two more days in which to act.

Mr. TAFT Mr. President, I believe that if the bill were sent back to conference, the amendment would be re-

jected. I do not know what would have happened if someone had thought of this in the beginning; but I do not think we are to blame for not thinking of something entirely different from what the Senator has proposed in his amendment. I believe that the House conferees-and I presume they would be the same conferees—would refuse to accept any further Senate amendments, I think that would be the inevitable result of a further conference. I should be glad to support the Senator's modified amendment in lieu of his original amendment; but if he asks whether I think we would get it, I will say that in my judgment we would not get it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will

the Senator yield? Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will recall that the House Committee on Banking and Currency reported the bill without any amendments. It even eliminated the Barkley amendment, which was put back in the bill on the floor of the House.

I believe that it would be idle to expect to get any better conference report than we have brought back. In the conference, and in discussions among Members of the House, and with others concerned, no one raised any great complaint about the prices now being obtained by those who produce cattle. The whole meat fight, and the situation which delayed the bill in the first place, was the situation which arose among the processors, the packers. That is why the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate held up the bill for nearly 2 months after it had completed hear-

ings and was ready to report the bill.
Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will
the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.
Mr. WHERRY. I always like to agree with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky; but when he states that the whole trouble was with the processors, I only have to refer him, and at least 24 other Members of the Senate, to meeting after meeting which we had with feeders, attempting to get a price level which would be profitable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Those meetings were held before the OPA established the subsidy for feeders. I still insist that what delayed consideration of the bill in the Senate was the furore raised about meat processing and the losses being sustained by packers all over the country. In an effort to deal with that situation and try to solve the problem, the whole bill was

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that an effort was made to help the processors. I voted for it. The distinguished Senator will recall that I asked him whether he thought there would be any reflection back to the farmer, and he said yes, and I agreed with him ...

Let me repeat that we have before us

a motion to disagree.

Mr. TAFT. No. Mr. President. If the Senator will yield to me, let me say that the question is on the agreeing to the conference report. The only thing which can be done is to vote for or against acceptance of the conference report.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say again that I did not anticipate when I started that I would endeavor to have a vote taken on the amendment. But those who have supported the amendment believe there should be a vote on it. I will make the motion. I shall only ask for a division. I shall not try to cause any long waiting, unless some other Senator wishes to do so. But, Mr. President, I say most respectfully to the distinguished majority leader and the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency that, while I appreciate what they have done, I cannot hold out any hope for any increase in meat production by holding cattle in the feed lots. When the Office of Price Administration itself admits there is a critical shortage of meat, we do not need to go further. We are told that there is no difficulty with prices, but that is just a misnomer. We are running head-on into a meat shortage. I hope it does not come to pass.

I hope the Senate will vote not to accept the conference report, and I hope it will be sent back for a further conference, in an effort to do something practical to get meat on the meat counters of the

country.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think it is a futility to vote against acceptance of the conference report. I think the conference report should be agreed to, much as I agree with many of the things the Senator from Nebraska has said.

CONSIDERATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its present considera-

I object.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to withhold his objection. I am not taking the floor from anyone.

Mr. TAFT. I object at the request of a Senator who is not now present.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well; I shall Later I shall submit the resolution in my own time.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to tell the Senator that I was requested to object to the presentation of the resolution at this time, when it is out of order.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator who requested that the objection be made is not present at this time. I am not making the objection on my own behalf.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I do not see why anyone who has the interest of world peace at heart can object to the introduction of a resolution, solely for the purpose of having it printed and lie on the table, in order that the Senate and the people of the United States at large may be informed as to the real purpose of the resolution. The resolu-tion is not to be acted upon tonight. It is not to be acted upon until the United Nations charter has been submitted to the Senate by the President of the United States and until it comes up in the Senate for consideration.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	McMahon
Austin	Ferguson	Mead
Ball	Fulbright	Millikin
Bankhead	George	Mitchell
Barkley	Green	Morse
Bilbo	Guffey	Murdock
Brewster	Gurney	Myers
Brooks	Hayden	Overton
Burton	Hill	Radcliffe
Butler	Hoey	Stewart
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Capper	Kilgore	Tunnell
Chavez	La Follette	Wagner
Cordon	Langer	Wherry
Donnell	McClellan	White
Downey	McFarland	
Eastland	McKellar	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fortynine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

OVERTON. Mr. President, the resolution I desire to have printed and lie on the table is not submitted for any action by the Senate at the present time. My sole purpose is to inform the Senate of the contents of the resolution, and to inform the people of the United States of what the purpose of the resolution is. I do not see why any Senator. unless he is violently opposed to the ratification of the United Nations Charter for World Peace, should be opposed to the mere filing of a resolution to be acted upon at some time in the future.

Mr. President, at the proper time I shall ask for action upon the resolution. While it is a matter which is to be submitted under the resolution, for the consideration of the Senate, I do not think personally that the Charter adopted at the San Francisco Conference requires any hearing by a committee of the United States Senate. The Charter had its origin back at the time when Churchill and our late beloved President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, met in midocean and promulgated the "four freedoms." In truth, it had its origin beyond that; it had its origin in the League of Nations, for which President Wilson strove immediately following the World War.

There were those who were opposed to the adoption of the Covenant of the League of Nations. There were those who fought it bitterly, and conspired on the floor of the Senate to fight it, and they fought it with success. The result is, in my judgment-I may be mistaken, and I hope to God I am-that thousands upon thousands of American youths have gone to their death because there was no league for world peace.

Mr. President, I think it would be a magnificent gesture on the part of the United States to take the foremost part in the ratification of this Charter. I think that prompt action by the Senate of the United States would have its effect upon other nations composing the United Nations. I think that it would have a world-wide influence. I believe it would have effect upon the morale of our boys who are fighting to secure and maintain the very purpose for which the Charter has been signed by the 50 nations composing the Conference at San Francisco, that is, world peace and world security.

Mr. President, I think it would have a further effect. I believe it would have an adverse effect upon the morale of the Japs, who are fighting the United States of America and our allies. I believe that prompt action on the part of the United States Senate would be an indication to our Japanese foes that we are determined not only to bring this war to a conclusion, but to take up arms, as united nations, against Japan or any other aggressor which seeks to throw the world again into another holocaust or world conflict.

The Charter adopted at San Francisco denounces aggression. It is a Charter which is inimical to the very purpose of our Japanese foes. It is a Charter which is not only a repudiation of but is a direct criticism against the dastardly attack of aggression made by the Japanese upon the people of the United States on December 7, 1941.

Mr. President, could there be anyone in these United States of America who would object to the mere filing and mere printing of a resolution that submitted to the Senate of the United States the question whether or not it should proceed immediately to the consideration of this Charter upon its submission to the Senate by the President of the United States?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the sincerity and the good faith and the nobility of purpose behind the Senator's resolution. So far as I am personally concerned. I myself am ready to vote on the Charter. I, along with all other Senators, and I think most of the public in the United States, have kept up with the proceedings from the inception of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference.

When that Conference had been concluded, the result of it was published in full throughout the country, and it has been discussed in editorials and speeches, and the public is thoroughly familiar with it. It has been modified to some extent, and I think improved, by the deliberations in San Francisco.

Likewise the public has kept current on the proceedings in San Francisco, and the result has been published in full in the press. The Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally] made a great speech in the Senate this morning, and I am satisfied the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VAN-DENBERG] will make a great speech tomorrow.

I myself am thoroughly satisfied, and would like to vote, and I think it would be a wonderful thing for the morale of the whole world if the United States Senate should be the first to ratify the treaty. Notwithstanding all that, I doubt the wisdom of the Senate saying to Notwithstanding all that, I anyone who has the right to be heard for a reasonable length of time that he will be denied that opportunity.

Mr. OVERTON. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. BARKLEY. Cartainly. Mr. OVERTON. That is not the purpose of the resolution. It opens it to debate for any Senator who desires to debate it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand it opens it to debate in the Senate, but it does not open it to hearings on the part of the general public. The Committee on For-eign Relations, according to my information, is to be called together Saturday to determine its procedure in regard to hearings, when they will begin, and how long they will last. I do not know that it is possible to fix the time at the first meeting. I have very definite ideas about a limitation on the length of the hearings, and while I would not wish to shut out any Member of the Senate who desired to debate the subject, I have very definite ideas as to how long the debate should last in the Senate.

I am afraid that the adoption of such a resolution as that which the Senator has offered might give the impression, notwithstanding our own good faith in the matter and our readiness to vote, that we were unwilling to allow anyone who either favored or opposed the treaty to have his day in court and make his views known. While I am satisfied that the discussion probably will not change any Senator's vote, in the interest of democratic processes it might be unwise to shut out any opportunity at all to those on the outside who might wish to appear and be heard before the committee.

For that reason I would not be able to support the Senator's resolution, certainly not until the committee had had an opportunity to weigh the situation and canvass it and determine as a committee what it thought its duties would be in regard to hearings. But I want to reiterate my thorough sympathy with the purposes of the Senator from Louisiana, for whom, as he knows, I have a profound respect and a very abiding and deep affection. And I always question the rightness of my own position when I find it to be contrary to that of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is very flattering. I appreciate his statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. It causes me to search my own heart to see if I am right when the Senator is on the other side.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.
Mr. BARKLEY. But I think it would
be misconstrued if we should say to the
country and even to the committee to
which the Charter must be referred when
it is submitted to the Senate, that we will
not give anyone an opportunity to be
heard.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I have a very high respect for the Senator's views and his opinion, as he well knows, and I cherish and must necessarily cherish for him a far greater admiration than he can possibly possess for me. Yet, I must repeat that the sole purpose of my rising from my seat on this occasion was merely to have a simple resolution filed. It is very short. Before I conclude I shall read it into the Record. It does not call for any action at the present time. It is purely informative. I merely ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. President, with further reference to what the able Senator from Kentucky has had to say, it is to be borne in mind that the principles underlying this great Charter, which has been signed by the representatives of the 50 United Nations, and is to be submitted on next Monday to the United States Senate by the President of the United States, were considered at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. Vast publicity was given to all that occurred at that conference, and the results of that conference were published far and wide throughout the United States and throughout the world.

For the last 9 weeks, as I recall the number, in San Francisco there have been assembled the representatives of 50 nations of the world, and they have gone over this Magna Carta with a fine tooth comb. They have analyzed it. They have considered it in all its aspects, and wide publicity has been given to it. The magazines, the newspapers, and the radio have carried the publicity. There is no question I think before the United States Senate or before the people of the United States that is more thoroughly understood than is this Charter.

It is not my purpose, if it be the will of the majority of the Senate to hold hearings, to prevent them from doing so. My sole purpose is to ask that the resolution be printed, and to submit the question to a majority vote of the Senate as to whether there should be any hearings conducted and whether we should not consider and debate and vote upon the Charter without its being submitted to any committee.

Mr. President, I cannot conceive that there would be any one who would care to appear before a committee having under consideration this Charter, unless he is an implacable foe to it and wants reservations attached to it, or unless he be a publicity seeker wanting to have his name appear in the headlines in the newspapers. And I have such a high regard for my colleagues in the United States Senate that I do not think that any of them who are in favor of the ratification of the Charter would want to consume the time of the Senate in debating the matter, with which all Senators are thoroughly familiar and with which the people of the United States at large are familiar.
Of course, if there be those who have

Of course, if there be those who have reservations which they desire to propose to the Charter they ought to be heard, and permitted to present their reservations, if any there be, and submit the question to a vote of the Senate at the time.

I now go back to what my purpose is, and that is simply for the information of the Senate to have the resolution printed. I will read the resolution. It is as follows:

Resolved, That when the United Nations Charter to maintain international peace and security, signed at San Francisco, Calif., on June 26, 1945, shall be laid before the Senate for ratification, the injunction of secrecy shall be removed, it shall be read a first time, and the Senate shall thereupon proceed to consider the same in open executive session.

That is all that the resolution proposes be done. It is not to be acted upon, I repeat, at the present time. My request is merely that my colleagues permit me to file this resolution at the desk and to have it printed. I renew that request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may send this resolution to the desk and that it be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator were permitted to file his resolution and to let it lie on the table, would it be in order to take it up at any time except during the morning hour, if we have another one, and then only on motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have listened to the eloquent statement of the Senator from Louisiana, but I should like to say that I think the Senate could do nothing which would do more harm to the San Francisco Charter than to proceed to its consideration without committee consideration. A small unimportant bill could be passed through the Senate under the procedure which the Senator from Louisiana proposes.

I say, Mr. President, in all sincerity, that if the Semate of the United States were to consider this measure in the cavalier manner which is proposed by the Senator from Louisiana it could only have the effect upon the country and upon the world of creating the impression that we do not regard the document of sufficient importance to give it the consideration which its importance merits.

Furthermore, Mr. President, as has been stated by the able majority leader, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, two of whose most able members have been delegates to this Conference. has been called to meet on Saturday to determine the procedure which it will follow in the consideration of this most important matter. It seems to me that with neither of those Senators present, to propose a resolution which undertakes to short-circuit that committee and deny it the opportunity to decide upon its procedure is an indication that the Senate does not have confidence in its own committee, which has jurisdiction over this subject.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I make this statement, Mr. President, as one who intends to support the Charter which has been brought back from San Francisco, but I wish to say that I think this document is of sufficient importance to merit careful consideration, and that it should go through the usual procedures, so that Senators as well as the country may be informed as to what the document itself contains. It has been greatly altered since it was drafted at Dumbarton Oaks.

I have made some study of the Charter since it has been made available to the public, but I venture the assertion that there is not a Senator present who can indicate and properly outline all of the intricate matters which are contained in the procedures involved in this document. I think it would be unfortunate if the people of this country did not have

the benefit of hearing the interpretations which will be placed upon the language of the document by those who participated in its framing. The United States will assume important obligations under this Charter, and the Members of the United States Senate and the public should have full knowledge and understanding of the interpretation of the language contained in the Charter by those who helped to frame it.

So, Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and of the able Senator from Michigan, who discharged his responsibilities with such outstanding achievement, I could not give my consent to the introduction of the resolution. If the Senator wishes to submit the resolution after the Committee on Foreign Relations has had an opportunity to meet and decide upon what procedure it is to follow, I shall not interpose objection; but believe this is a proposal for a snap judgment which I believe would be most unfortunate from the standpoint of the most ardent advocates of the Charter.

Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. BROOKS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-

ator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with the question as to whether the Senator from Louisiana should be permitted to submit his resolution, let me say that tomorrow is Friday. It would be impossible for him to move that it be considered tomorrow. In all likelihood the same situation will prevail on Saturday. So there would be no opportunity whatever even to make a motion or an attempt to get it before the Senate before the committee meets. The question I rose to propound is whether, in view of that situation, the Senator feels that it is necessary to object to the submission of the resolution.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky well knows that under the rule, if the Senator from Louisiana should obtain unanimous consent to submit his resolution today, and there should be an adjournment of the Senate, it would be in order for him to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution at any time thereafter.

The only thing to which I object is that the resolution should be submitted at this hour of the night, when very few Senators are present, and especially when the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan are not present.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I wish to state to the Senator from Wisconsin that I conferred with the Senator from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, before I first undertook to have the resolution printed, and he stated to me that he had no objection to it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, I accept the Senator's statement in that regard, but I do not think the Senator from Michigan should be ignored on this important question of procedure. The Foreign Relations Committee should not be foreclosed from considering this important document.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. It is not my purpose to seek to have the Committee on Foreign Relations discharged. If the Committee on Foreign Relations meets on Saturday and determines to hold hearings, and sets a date for hearings, I shall not press the resolution. I do not ask that the committee be discharged. My thought at the time was that the committee did not intend to take any action until the Charter has been submitted to the Senate, and that the Charter would be referred to the committee, or else the Senate would act upon a resolution similar to mine. However, if the committee meets in advance of submission of the Charter, and determines to hold hearings, I shall certainly not press the resolution.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If I can have an understanding with the able Senator from Louisiana that if the Committee on Foreign Relations meets on Saturday and determines to hold hearings, the Senator will then not press his resolution, I shall not interpose any further objection.

Mr. OVERTON. I certainly agree to that. I will do better than that. I will now submit the resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is entirely satisfactory to me. I wish the Senator to understand that my only desire in this matter is to see that this important question receives the consideration which I believe its importance merits.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I now submit the resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. GEORGE and Mr. BROOKS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, of course I have no objection to the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I was about to give notice that I would move, when the resolution was submitted, to refer it to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I rather regret that the resolution has been submitted, because it raises an issue which to my mind ought not to be raised under existing conditions. I have the greatest respect for the proponent of the resolution, and so far as I am concerned I think I know enough about the Charter, perhaps, to enable me to cast an intelligent vote on it at this time. I was a member of a committee on which approximately 8 Senators served, which collaborated with the State Department for many months before the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, when the foundations of the Dumbarton Oaks charter itself were being laid. I am reasonably familiar, I hope, with the changes which have been made at San Francisco. But, Mr. President, I think it would be regarded throughout the world as a flippant act if the Senate of the United States were to vote its ratification or adherence to the Charter without very thorough consideration.

This is no trivial matter. This is no matter of small import or importance. The Charter presents a most significant and in many respects a most drastic change in the whole history of the foreign policy of this Government, and it ought to be most carefully considered. Not in the entire history of this Republic has any proposal of this kind, with all its vast implications, even been submitted to the Congress with a fair chance of ratification. I am very thoroughly in favor of international cooperation, and I think I could vote, with full assurance of safety, for ratification of a treaty embodying the deliberations and conclusions reached at San Francisco. But hearings should be held upon this matter. The interpreta-tions placed upon it by our own State Department and by those who have represented us in the conference should be of record.

To my mind, Mr. President, this is one of the most important steps the United States Senate has ever been called upon to take. I know that it is by all odds the most important declaration of foreign policy that our Nation has ever made, if this Charter be ratified. Certainly there should be hearings; there should be opportunity for anyone who might oppose it to be heard. But even if no one opposes it, and if all are agreed to its ratification-as I hope they will be when the final vote is taken-it is still of the utmost importance that the clear meaning and intent and the far-reaching implications of this undertaking on the part of our country, an undertaking that will affect not us alone now, or the generation immediately ahead, but perhaps all succeeding generations of America, should be definitely and clearly stated of record,

So, Mr. President, while, of course, I do not resist, and I am very happy that my distinguished friend the Senator from Louisiana has himself asked that his resolution go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I think the matter is of such great importance that I should give some expression of my feelings upon it. I do so the more readily because the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations is not now present in the Chamber; and during his absence in San Francisco I have, at his request, served as acting chairman of the committee. If no other member of the Foreign Relations Committee had asked for reference of the resolution to that committee. I certainly would have done

Mr. WHITE and Mr. BROOKS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to express my complete concurrence in what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. La Folettette] and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. George]. Notwithstanding the understanding which has been reached with respect to this matter, I still regret the presentation of the resolution and the consideration which we have had of it up to this time in the Senate itself. Mr. President, it seems to me that the document which has been brought back from San Francisco will take its place in history as one of the

four greatest documents in the whole history of our Nation. It is unthinkable to me that there should be a suggestion or a desire that a document of such transcendent importance, so vital to the interests of this Nation, and of such concern to the whole world, should not be considered by the standing committee of the Senate which by the rules of the Senate is required to give study to all matters which relate to our foreign rela-

Mr. President, the greater the importance of the subject matter, the greater the reason why the Committee on Foreign Relations should have the documents before it, should hear the testimony, and should have its members search their own minds and search the minds of those who come before the committee, and the greater the reason why the members of the committee should pass ultimate judgment and should make ultimate recommendation to the Senate itself.

If this matter were a trivial one, similar to matters which are passed upon every day in the Senate, I still would not wish to see a committee of the Senate to which the subject matter rightly belonged deprived of its jurisdiction, deprived of an opportunity to make a study and to make recommendations to this body.

As I said, in the absence of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally], the chairman of our delegation to San Francisco and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and in the absence of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who throughout the long years has made mighty contributions to the cause of international peace and international understanding, it is-and I say it again-unthinkable that we should proceed as was first suggested.

Mr. President, I hope the Foreign Relations Committee will speedily meet, and I hope it will provide for hearings. I hope those hearings will be of sufficient length to enable the thinking minds of America to have opportunity to express themselves regarding this sub-

When that has been done, and when that committee reports to the Senate, I hope the Senate in like spirit and with like diligence will give consideration to the problems presented.

Mr. President, I am one of those who have long favored an international undertaking in behalf of justice and peace and good will among nations; but we make no contribution to ultimate good of such a proposal when we undertake to deal with a matter of this great import without every consideration which our minds can bring to bear on the subject.

So I hope study will be had, I hope thought will be had, I hope prayer will be had with respect to this instrument. When thorough consideration has been given to it by the Senate committee, I hope the committee will voice its sanction, and I hope the Senate itself will voice its approval, and the whole world will think and know that we have done rightly. But I would not cut a corner anywhere with respect to this matter. Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I rose

originally to object to the filing of the

resolution. I do not wish to object to it, since request has been made that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I subscribe to the sentiments expressed by the distinguished senior representative of the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations and by the minority leader.

I wish to voice this thought as a warning; I say this now, and probably I will say it again; I doubt if there is any Member of the Senate today serving by the suffrage of his people who longs and yearns for peace more than does the junior Senator from Illinois. I have seen two wars,, and in one of them I faced in the front lines the same enemy we have just conquered.

I served in the Senate when I heard the dramatic appeals for help step by step. We were then urged to act hurriedly, and we were told that it would keep us out of war. I finally saw it take us into war. We heard the claims that it would keep us out of war. I was subject to de-nunciation because I objected to it at the time. I was charged with acting to obstruct the road which would keep us out of war. Still I heard the call from across the sea, "Give us tools." They said they did not want our men. Then, later, I saw our men go; I, with the other Members of the Senate, saw them go abroad. All Members of the Congress say them go there. Our country supplied 75 percent of the men who fought on our side of the Allied lines. I saw them in the prison camps. I saw them in the concentration camps. I never wish to see it again.

Now I say that I rather think I shall vote for ratification of the Charter; but if there is any attempt to hurry it through, I must say that we have just had a demonstration from one Member of the Senate today and yesterday; and I am younger, and I think I might talk longer, until we hold this matter up long enough for the American people to get an understanding of it.

Let me review it quickly. When the Dumbarton Oaks Conference was held in the historic old park in Washington, and Senators sought to ask questions. they were hushed, and it was said, "That is on a lower level. You will have plenty of opportunity." Now comes the dress parade, and now our distinguished colleagues of the Senate have returned. I applauded them when they came in. and I applauded the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning, and if the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] will do tomorrow what I think he will, I shall applaud him. I shall applaud the President when he comes. He is a great President of the United States, and I am sure he hopes to do right.

But I say to my colleagues, Mr. President, and I join the senior Senator from Georgia in saying it, that this will be the most drastic step taken within our lifetime for the future of the world, and unless the people of America believe in it. unless we give them a chance to examine it, unless we have an understanding of it, and unless whatever questions there may be are asked both in the hearings and then in this forum, we will be a mockery to the tradition that was handed down to us from the founding fathers.

With all sincerity, as one who hopes for peace and will probably vote for this document for peace, I ask those in charge to see that adequate time is taken. There is no rush about this matter. We are leading the way now. We led the way on the battle fronts. We saved Russia with our implements. We saved England, we saved France, and if we are to save humanity, we can do it best and only if the people of America believe that we honestly and sincerely want them to know that we are aware of what we are doing, and welcome an opportunity to hear from them.

I say to the senior Senator from Georgia, with whom I went to Europe, and in whom I have a great and abiding faith, do not let anyone rush this matter. It is moving all right. Even if we adopt the Charter, it is only the first step, it is merely the beginning. It is a little bit of a Charter upon which we may build and grow. Any suggestion that when the Constitution was adopted by this country it was an imperfect instrument has no relation to the present situation. At least it was adopted then by the people who came to this continent to get away from the Old World. We on this continent surely are not going again to adopt something in the hope that the people abroad may follow, with their animosities, with their hatreds, with their racial distinctions and their cruelties, which we have seen, which we never would endure here.

Mr. President, this is a profound proposal, and I am wondering if we should hurry it to a conclusion even in a month. I should not object if we should do it that fast, but I shall object to anything that would speed it to a conclusion within that time. We must have the opportunity to discuss it together and meet our responsibilities. Then we can say, as we go on through life, that we have conscientiously, earnestly, honestly, and intelligently tried to lay the foundation for a future world in which we will have at least more peace than we have had before.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am very happy to see the evidence of harmony which prevails here tonight with respect to the procedure upon this great proposal. I feel interested to express my view about that procedure because it might be supposed that my record in this matter would bear the interpretation that I should like to see this Charter agreed to at the earliest moment, whereas the truth is that I should like to have it agreed to at the earliest practicable moment according to the word and the spirit of the Moscow declaration and of the Connally resolution.

In this case it happens that the treaty comes back to us differing in substance and form from the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and the differences are material and substantial. In my judgment, founded upon one reading and a little bit of review of the treaty, some of the changes are very great. The form and style of the organization have been changed, and the public has never been able to obtain, even from the current very able reports which have been published in the newspapers, what is now visible in this definite form of treaty.

Therefore I think that it is wise for us to agree that we should proceed with all the deliberation that is necessary in order that the public may have an opportunity to know what the charter now contains. What has gone before in publicity is useful, it will help a great deal in leading up to the knowledge that is necessary to form an intelligent opinion upon the proposals on which we will have to pass. I speak of the opinion of the public.

Therefore, as a practical thing, it seems to me that the announcement made of a tentative program by the Senate leader, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, that we take up on the 9th of July the hearings in the committee on this proposal, is a practical proposition, a tentative plan to proceed after a week's notice, giving the public ample time in which to get ready to come here with any proposal they wish to make, to file petitions if they desire to do so, and giving Senators an opportunity to arrange their affairs also if they desire to The proappear before the committee. posal to proceed on the 9th of July it seems to me is as practicable a one as has been presented.

Mr. President, I hope it will be the general feeling in the Senate that we should not plunge into this matter with great intemperance and haste, but that we should give ample notice and then sit down and work diligently and with as good speed as the questions involved permit.

Mr. President, I am glad the resolution which provoked this discussion is to be referred to the committee, and that the discussion has disclosed what it has shown with respect to the harmony of feeling in the Senate regarding the substance of the treaty and regarding the proceedings in respect to it.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I believe that this Charter should be considered by the Senate in Committee of the Whole, but inasmuch as it is customary to have treaties go before the Committee on Foreign Relations, it is my urgent hope that the committee will see fit to publish daily records of the proceedings before the committee, so that all Members of the Senate may familiarize themselves with the hearings. All too frequently that is not done, and it is impossible for all of us to attend the hearings and listen to what is going on. I think this is a matter of such importance that every Member of the Senate should be familiar with the proceedings, and it is my hope that the hearings may be published currently so that all Members of the Senate may have an opportunity to

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Overton] will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 148) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That when the United Nations Charter to maintain international peace and security, signed at San Francisco, Calif., on June 26, 1945, shall be laid before the Senate for ratification, the injunction of secrecy shall be removed, it shall be read a first time, and the Senate shall thereupon proceed to consider the same in open executive session.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3550) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SNYDER, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Mahon, Mr. Norrell, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. POWERS, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, and Mr. Case of South Dakota were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 57, 61, 103, 107, 114, 115, 121, 125, 134, 135, 140, 147½, 158, 159, 164, 214, 217, 219, 221½, 222, 228, 229, 232, 233, 236, 237, 238, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 248, 250, 251, 253, 257, 260, 265, 268, 270, 275, 278, 279, 287, 300, 306, 311, and 321 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 11, 50, 64, 65, 123, 129, 145, 155, 156, 160, 165, 176, 177, 1781/2, 181, 258, 264, 280, and 320 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154 to the bill, and concurred therein with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS — CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 30) extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope we can get a vote on the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to address the Senate. I was merely saying I hoped that we might vote on the conference report, which is the pending question. I do not wish to shut any Senator off.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, there are quite a few Members of the Senate now present who were not here at the

time the junior Senator from Nebraska IMr. Wherryl was making such an impassioned appeal for reconsideration by the conferees of the conference report which would extend the life of the OPA for another year. His plea was based entirely on the fact that the cost of production was not provided for, especially for the livestock interests, and more specifically for those livestock interests which feed cattle, hogs, and sheep.

It is the contention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Wherry], joined in by me, that there is only one reason for the people of the United States not having sufficient beeksteak, pork, and mutton on their tables daily. The reason is that critters are being sent to market which are weighing approximately 400 pounds less than they should weigh.

If I may, I should like to have the attention of Senators for only a few moments. We in the West, who live among livestock men, know the conditions which prevail. It breaks our hearts to see the feeding plants on our large farms not operating. Many of them are in bad repair. It is bad for the morale of a traveler to ride through the prosperous farming country of the West and see large feed lots unused. Their lack of use is not economical. The corn should not be shipped to market. It should be fed. There can be no question about that. I believe that we in the West understand the situation a little more clearly than do many persons who live in the eastern and southern sections of the country. I do not believe that many persons living in those sections have ever seen a feeding lot where 2,000 cattle are being fed. We have feed lots capable of taking care of that many head of cattle. So we are making a last plea for putting beefsteak on the tables of the people who have a right to have it.

Mr. President, there are only three questions which are being asked throughout the country today. The number one question is with regard to the war situation. Discussions are being held with reference to what is happening to our boys who are in the military forces.

The No. 2 question is with reference to the San Francisco Charter. However, if one wishes to get into a real argument all he needs to do is to talk to some person with reference to whether he would like to have some pork chops or beefsteaks on his table. There is no reason in the world why he should not have them.

Those of us who know the livestock feeding business do not believe that the conferees handling this matter exercised the same degree of imagination which we have exercised in the West. We should like to have them make one more effort to reach an agreement providing cost of production under the modified form of the Wherry amendment as suggested by the Senator from Nebraska. That would improve the morale of the American more than anything else would. In the conference report there should be a provision that the livestock feeder-not the range man, the processor, or the packing house, but the man who feeds corn and other grains-be given a profit for his efforts. If that were done meat would be provided for

civilian use throughout the United States, and plenty for the military forces as well.

Mr. President, I join the Senator from Nebraska in his request that the Senate conferees have a further conference and make one real effort. I believe if they tell the story to the House conferees, those conferees will see the light and go along with the proposal.

Mr. President, I think the matter is important. Therefore, I ask for the

yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

CONSIDERATION OF UNITED NATIONS

CHARTER

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask that we revert for a moment to the discussion which preceded the statement of the Senator from South Dakota, and call attention to one point which, it seems to me, we should all bear in mind.

Associating myself completely, as I do, with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Vermont, and the Senator from Maine, I may point out that the popular revulsion to polls is now being directed to the Senate of the United States. I have been asked, as I presume many other Members of this body have, to pass judgment upon a matter which we are now approaching in the solemnity of this occasion and which, it seems to me, involves a question of a quasijudicial nature. However much our hearts are moved by this appeal, and our minds inclined to its support, it will be very much more conducive to appropriate and democratic consideration of the matter if Senators will show deference even to the smallest minority of this country which may desire to come before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and discuss the situation which, as the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, is in many material respects different from what has ever previously been presented.

Mr. President, I have confidence in those who have represented us in connection with this great issue. Yet, out of deference to even the smallest minority of this country, I venture to assert that we shall render our country a service if we will at least defer, so far as practicable, our own decisions until the matter may be given that appropriate consideration which has been so earnestly urged. I hope that while the subject is being considered there will not go out through the country today or tomorrow the word that 40, 50, 60, or 70 Senators have already passed judgment upon the matter, and that is is a closed book. I assert that we will do little service to the dignity of this body if we thus anticipate in advance the decisions resulting from the deliberations which will be held in connection with this very important subject at such a solemn time as the present.

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS — CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 30) extending the effective period of the

Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	McMahon
Austin	Ferguson	Mead
Ball	- Fulbright	Millikin
Bankhead	George	Mitchell
Barkley	Gerry	Morse
Bilbo	Green	Murdock
Brewster	Guffey	Myers
Brooks	Gurney	Overton
Burton	Hill	Radcliffe
Butler	Hoey	Stewart
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Capper	Kilgore	Tunnell
Chavez	La Follette	Wagner
Cordon	Langer	Wherry
Donnell	McClellan	White
Downey	McFarland	
Eastland	McKellar	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fortynine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing on a conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a while ago when request was made for the yeas and nays, I did not raise my hand. I have no objection to a yea-and-nay vote on the question if it will accommodate Senators. I thought we might save time by not having a yea-and-nay vote, but we might not, so I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Reed]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. Anprews], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Balley], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Johnson], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Pepper], [Mr. the Senator from Oklahoma THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Thomas], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Typings], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Walsh], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. Wheeler] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] are detained from the Senate on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent in Europe visiting battlefields.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Mc-CARRAN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent as members of the committee to attend the funeral of the late Senator Scrugham.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Thomas]

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Vandenberg] has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally].

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Buck], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Bushfield], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Hart], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Hawkes], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Moore], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Revercomb], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Smith], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Willey], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Willis] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKEN-LOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Reed], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Shipstead], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Tobey], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Wilson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. Thomas] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business by direction of the President pro tempore of the Senate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] is absent on official business of the Senate attending the funeral of the late Senator Scrugham.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 8, as follows:

YEAS-40

Aiken	Ellender	McMahon
Austin	Fulbright	Mead
Ball	George	Millikin
Bankhead	Gerry	Mitchell
Barkley	Green	Murdock
Bilbo	Guffey	Myers -
Brewster	Hill	Overton
Brooks	Hoey	Radcliffe
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Byrd	Kilgore	Taft
Capper	La Foilette	Tunnell
Chavez	McClellan	Wagner
Downey	McFarland	
Eastland	McKellar	

NAYS-8

Butler Cordon Donnell	Ferguson Gurney Langer	Morse Wherry
	NOT VOTING	3-47

Andrews	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bailey	Lucas	Taylor
Bridges	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Briggs	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Moore	Tobey
Capehart	Murray -	Tydings
Chandler	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Connally	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Glass	Pepper	Wheeler
Hart	Reed	White
Hatch	Revercomb	Wiley
Hawkes	Robertson	Willis
Hayden	Russell	Wilson
Hickenlooper	Saltonstall	Young
Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead	The second second

So the conference report was agreed to.

WAR AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3368) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parlia-

mentary inquiry.

PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. What is the pending busi-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The war agencies appropriation bill, which was temporarily set aside.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in regard to the bill and the controversy which has arisen in connection with it.

I have no political purpose to serve in any statement which I may make on the subject of the Fair Employment Practice Committee, or in any vote which I expect to cast upon it. My political fortunes will not in any way enter into any statement which I may make or any vote which I may cast. I have supported the Fair Employment Practice Committee from the day when it was created by Executive order by President Roosevelt. If given an opportunity, I intend to vote for the \$446,000 provided in the amendment which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has given notice he will offer.

Around that proposal, however, has arisen a situation which in my judgment is doing no service to the Senate. have just had a great gathering of the nations in San Francisco. It must have been a moving ceremony on last Tuesday when the President witnessed the signature of 50 nations and addressed the final session of the conference. We heard a great speech this morning from our colleague the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am sure that we shall hear a great speech tomorrow by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VAN-DENBERG].

We are in the atmosphere of democratic thought-freedom, liberty, and justice. In my judgment it is unfortunate that that happy mood and posture on the part of the Senate should in any way be marred by a controversy which may lead to feeling and to dissipation of the high mood in which we find ourselves over a world situation and over our own national participation in that world situation as a result of the greatest war in history.

The appropriation bill which is now pending before the Senate involves more than the FEPC. It involves the operating expenses of 12 or more war agencies which will be without funds on next Monday morning unless the bill is passed.

While I intended to vote for the amount involved in the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, and probably might say a few words in behalf of the amendment, I take the responsibility of saying that in my judgment funds for the other war agencies are more important than any one particular organization which is involved in this appropriation bill. That means that I think they are more important than the

amount of money that may be appropriated for the Fair Employment Practice Committee.

There are pending in the Senate and in the House bills which have been reported by the respective committees to make that organization permanent. I do not know whether either of those bills has any prospect of being enacted into law. I shall not now debate that question.

For the past 48 hours I have been more or less of a messenger boy between the contending forces, to see if we could arrive at some conclusion with respect to this controversy, pass the bill providing the necessary funds for the war agencies, and extricate the Senate from a situation which seems to me to be unfortunate.

It has been suggested that the amount involved be reduced from \$446,000 to \$250,000; and I think in all likelihood that agreement would have been entered into except for some difference as to the language proposed, by which it had been suggested that the \$250,000 be earmarked for 6 months, with the provision that the appropriation should expire on the 31st day of December, and should not be available beyond that date, on the theory that if funds were not made available beyond that date, the Fair Employment Practice Committee would expire and could no longer function.

I think we may as well concede what is the fact, namely, that this organization was set up by Executive order, and it will endure until the Executive order is rescinded or until the war has ended and 6 months have elapsed thereafter.

So, Mr. President, if we were to cut off all the funds of the FEPC tomorrow night or Saturday night, the organization would not go out of existence. The Executive order would not be rescinded. We would deny funds to the organization, but it could continue to function with all the power it now enjoys, except it would have no money with which to pay its expenses, and it would have to function without funds or compensation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is there not a provision in an appropriation bill to the effect that any agency for which funds are denied shall automatically be discontinued, and that it shall be illegal for it to continue?

Mr. BARKLEY. There was a provision to that effect in an appropriation bill passed last year, but I believe that provision was contained in the independent offices appropriation bill, and it would not apply to this agency.

Mr. President, the organization could continue to function; it would not be liquidated, in the sense that it would go out of business, if we were to deny it an appropriation now. It might be entirely possible for people interested in its continuance to make contributions to pay its expenses. Certainly that would be a most unfortunate thing, namely, for Congress to deny appropriations to an agency set up by the President by Executive order, in compliance with his authority under the Constitution and under the statutes, and to have that organization pass the hat around, to obtain funds with which to continue to function.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President. will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it also possible that if a skeleton organization could be maintained, it might appeal to already existing governmental agencies to assist it in carrying on its functions, and thus create a somewhat embarrassing situation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is possible. But, Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the President could not allocate to the organization funds at his disposal, because in an appropriation bill passed last year we provided by the Russell amendment, I believe, that the President could not take out of funds available to him any allotment for this purpose.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the Senator. But would not such a situation be embarrassing to the Department of Justice or to any other departments which might be asked to assist?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. Such a request could be made, and it might be embarrassing.

Mr. President, someone must take the responsibility for making a concrete suggestion to get us out of this situation, and I am going to take that responsibility. I have no feeling of animosity in any way in regard to this matter. I do not wish to see any such feeling or animosity injected into the situation if it can be avoided, and I believe it can be. I know that Senators on both sides of the matter are patriotic and reasonable, and I know they wish to do their duty as they see it. I believe that under these circumstances those who are asking for the entire \$446,000 for the fiscal year could well afford to agree to the appropriation of \$250,000, which has been discussed in efforts to bring about an agreement. I believe that those who are opposed to the appropriation of any amount of money at all for the agency could well agree to the appropriation of that sum of money. I also believe-and I hope the suggestion will not fall on unfertile soil-that in view of the existing facts, the agency can continue to function anyway.

So, Mr. President, I hope the appropriation of \$250,000, which has been suggested as a solution of the problem, will be agreed to by both sides-and it will not be limited to expenditure in the first 6 months, for the very reason that the organization could continue to function beyond that time, even if we were to provide a 6-month limit, during which the funds could be used.

There is another suggestion I wish to make. The appropriation of this limited sum of money would necessarily compel the organization to cut down its personnel to about one-half of what it is now, especially if it undertook to spread out the funds over the 12-month period. The organization would have to spread the \$250,000 over the period during which it was intended to use the \$446,000. In the meantime, there would be on the calendar the bill providing for the permanent setting up or continuance as a permanent organization of the Fair Employment Practice Committee; and if that bill could not pass through Congress, I certainly would feel that no one would have any right to insist or could with propriety insist, beyond that, that Congress appropriate for an organization which it was unwilling to set up as a permanent agency of Government.

This organization has been a war organization. On the whole, I think it has done good. It has settled approximately 5,000 controversies. I think 3,500 controversies were dismissed because they had no merit. It now has pending approximately 1,500 controveries which

have been filed before it.

I believe that during the remainder of the war—and, if the war should end before the end of the fiscal year, during the interim—this committee might serve a good purpose, certainly in certain sections of the country where, as a result of the war, a large number of people have migrated from one section to another, and will present a problem to those communities when the war is over and when the war activities have ceased.

So, Mr. President, in order to form the basis for an agreement, and not run the risk of having to consider the appropriation bill after the end of the month, and thus embarrass these agencies which are so essential, I earnestly appeal to those who have been arguing for the entire amount to agree to a reduction to \$250,000, and I earnestly appeal to my friends who are opposed to any appropriation at all to agree that that amount may be used during the fiscal year, because even if it is denied the organization can continue to function, anyway.

I believe that would be a fair solution of this problem, and I appeal to the sincerity and good faith of Senators on both sides, in order that we may extricate the Senate from a situation which, in view of all the conditions, it seems to me should not be perpetuated.

I offer that suggestion. I, myself, am willing to take the responsibility. If the Senator from New Mexico, in view of his attitude, does not feel that he can do it, I, myself, am willing to take the responsibility of offering the amendment, namely, to reduce the appropriation to the amount I have suggested.

I make that suggestion, not because I wish to take the amendment out of the hands of the Senator from New Mexico, but because I do not wish to embarrass him

If that can be agreed to—of course, it would have to carry with it the understanding that no point of order would be made against that kind of an amendment—I believe we can arrive at a solution of this matter which will be in the interest of the Senate, and the country, and both sides of the controversy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, our beloved majority leader has suggested that he will assume full responsibility. I want this body and the whole world to know that I have never avoided a responsibility or neglected a duty. I feel that I have a duty to

perform and a responsibility to assume in connection with this particular matter.

The suggestion made by the Senator from Kentucky appeals to me immensely. I have been ready to compromise right along, but I will not compromise with any Tory idea that the Declaration of Independence was a mistake. I will not compromise with any idea that the Constitution of the United States means nothing. I will not compromise with any idea that Lincoln's Gettysburg Address was a mistake and that it does not now live. I will not compromise with any idea that we should allow less than a third of the Members of this body to control legislation and impose their wills by talk upon more than two-thirds of the Members of this body. I will not compromise with any idea that we should do away with the noble thoughts which the Senator from Kentucky has stated were expressed at San Francisco. I feel that the Senator from Kentucky was correct in what he said about San Francisco. If we are being asked to compromise now on something which will do away with the very idea of the charter of San Francisco, I do not feel like compromising.

Mr. President, allow me to tell the Senator from Kentucky and other Members of this body what the President of the United States said at San Francisco about the San Francisco Charter in connection with the history-making point which has to do, so far as I am concerned, with the very issues which we are now discussing. The President said:

Under this document-

Speaking of the United Nations Charter—

we have good reason to expect the framing of an international bill of rights—

Is there anything wrong in this body having at least a recognition and a conception of the fact that we do have a Bill of Rights, that we do have a Constitution, and that we do fight and die for our rights?

I continue reading:

acceptable to all the nations involved. That bill of rights will be as much a part of international life as our own Bill of Rights is a part of our Constitution. The Charter is dedicated to the achievement and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

What are we asking for outside of that, Mr. President, except as it may pertain to our domestic problems?

I continue reading:

Unless we can attain those objectives for all men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language, or religion—we cannot have permanent peace and security.

The President was speaking of the international aspect. I repeat:

Unless we can attain those objectives for all men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language, or religion—we cannot have permanent peace and security.

I wish to make another observation in reference to what the President of the United States said about this particular matter. The President sent a message from San Francisco to a gathering in New York. It was referred to in the Evening Star on June 26, 1945, as follows:

President Truman, in a message to the rally, extended "hearty greetings to all who gather to reaffirm the faith in the policies and principles of my lamented predecessor, firm in the conviction that the Fair Employment Practices Committee which he brought into being is an instrument to promote national unity."

Mr. President, in view of all those facts, as well as the fact that more than two-thirds of this body now wishes to vote on the matter, I am susceptible to the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky. He knows that no Member who has proposed any amendment, whether it be for \$1, \$250,000, or \$446,000 has delayed consideration of this measure. What is the record? The bill was reported by the Committee on Appropriations approximately the middle of last week.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, let me say that I have made my suggestion in the hope that something could be accomplished. If the Senator is willing to accept it, the best thing to do is to accept it and not get into a controversy as to who has caused any of the delay which has taken place. I hope we will not try to keep books against one another so as to show who has occupied most of the time during this debate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well; but the Senator from Kentucky has perhaps forgotten what he said at the time he started to make his statement. He intimated that the delay had been caused on our side of the Chamber.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; I made no such intimation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will accept \$250,000 and allow the amendment to be agreed to without any language being added to it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senator's amendment should be adopted, would it prevent any of the proponents of the FEPC from asking for more money at any time during the year?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the answer is "No." There is no way by which one Congress can bind another Congress or itself not to appropriate more funds if additional funds should be requested. I think, if the understanding which has been suggested shall be entered into, it will be observed by both sides of the controversy.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The reason I asked the question—

Mr. BARKLEY. From a parliamentary and legal standpoint, the answer to the Senator's question is "No." Any Senator may at any time move to increase any appropriation. The same situation, however, would exist which now exists unless an appropriation bill should hereafter come to the Senate containing an item on this subject. No Senator could offer an amendment except under the circumstances which surround the offering of this amendment, which require

a motion to suspend the rule, and a twothirds vote to suspend the rule would be necessary in order that the amendment might be offered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If it were limited to 6 months, that is, to December 31, it would give it a different status, however, would it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. My attention was distracted for the moment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If we limited the appropriation to December 31, 1945, under the law which is now in existence, this agency having been created by an Executive order, they could not demand any money after that, unless the Senate and the House appropriated it?

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely; that is true.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina.

But they could-

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment, if the Senator will allow me to answer his question clearly, if I can. No additional amount of money could be appropriated, or could be obtained, because the law now prevents the President from allocating, out of any funds at his disposal, any amount whatever for this purpose. that when the \$250,000 is expended, there will be no additional funds available to them, and no additional funds could be allocated to them except by appropriation, which would mean both Houses and the President.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the same would apply if no limitation were put on; no money could be used unless additional funds were appropriated.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I tried to explain, the situation is practically the same, so far as the life of this organization is concerned, whether we limit the \$250,000 to 6 months or allow it to be spread out over the 12 months. There is no practical difference in effect.

Mr. President, I hope that we may, by the time we resume our session tomorrow, arrive at an understanding on this matter. I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President— Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry. Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from New Mexico desires to ask a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not think it is quite correct to get an agreement from me and let the other side go on talking during the evening as to what they are going to do tomorrow. I want to find out what they are going to do tomor-

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico, the proposal I have made has been made here rather late. So far as I am concerned, I appreciate the frankness of the Senator in agreeing to accept this amount under the circumstances which I have indicated. If it is desired that other Senators confer about the matter until tomorrow, I think there is nothing unreasonable about that, and I believe it will aid in getting an agreement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Kentucky will withdraw his motion. I tried a little while ago to make clear the position of the proponents of the FEPC, that it was not our fault that the bill was being delayed. I think leadership is more at fault than those who are proposing the legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know just what the Senator means by that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will tell the Senator, if he will give me an opportunity.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to get into a debate here over my shortcomings. Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on this vote I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McCLELLAN. On the vote for recess?

Mr. TAFT. On the vote for a recess. Mr. BARKLEY. Very well; let us give them the yeas and nays.

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry. Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. What right has the Senator from Ohio to demand the yeas and nays on the motion which I have made, but on which I have not yielded the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. The motion is not debatable.

PRESIDING OFFICER. No The

other motion can now be made.

Mr. TAFT. The yeas and nays-Mr. BARKLEY. I have not yielded

the floor.

Mr. TAFT. When the Senator makes a motion to recess, that ends the thing;. that is not debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. I withheld the motion in order that I might yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But the Senator never gave me an opportunity to say anything. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I give the Senator the opportunity now.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will tell the Senator from Kentucky why I think the leadership was at fault in delaying this particular matter.

The Committee on Appropriations reported this bill the middle of last week. It was in charge of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee. He had charge of the bill, but for reasons better known to himself-and no intimation that anything wrong is being done is made-the bill was not called on Friday or Saturday, and we adjourned until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with that, now, since the Senator from New Mexico has brought it up, last Thursday we had before us a matter which was disposed of, and were about to go into executive session to consider the nomination of Mr. Wickard to be Administrator of REA, and it had been my purpose on that day, and on the day previous, to hold a session on Friday to consider this appropriation bill. The Senator from New Mexico came to my desk here and suggested on Thursday that the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations desired that this matter go over until Monday. I asked the Senator from New Mexico what his attitude was about it, and he said he did not feel that any time would be gained by holding a session on Friday; and feeling that it was the understanding and agreement between the Senator from New Mexico and the acting chairman of the committee that a session not be held on Friday, I said, "I will agree that the bill go over until Monday."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I was not doubting the attitude of the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill. and when he said it would take until Monday, of course I agreed to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President— Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want the Senator from New Mexico to accuse

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not accusing anyone.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of being responsible for this delay, because I was anxious to have a session on Friday, but it was represented to me that it had been generally understood that the matter would go over until Monday, and not being in charge of the bill myself, and not being in charge of the Senator's amendment, I did not feel it was incumbent upon me to object to an adjournment until Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr., President-Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I feel that an unjust statement has been made in reference to

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me just there, I wish to remind the Senator that we had intended to take up this bill on Monday, but the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Scrugham] had died in the meantime, and on Monday we had to recess on that account. That caused another delay.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think I should have opportunity to say what the facts were. Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. We reported this bill on Wednesday. I intended to take it up on Thursday. Instead of doing that, the REA matter came up and took most of the afternoon, as I recall, and the Senate was adjourned. I was not consulted; I did not ask that the bill go over. I was not consulted about it going over until Monday. I was very anxious to have the appropriation bills passed. I am not reflecting on the Senator from Kentucky. Someone must have told him I wanted it to go over. I had never said a word to a human soul about it going over. I would have preferred to have a session on Friday, because I knew that what has taken place was going to take place, that we were going to get into a controversy, and I was very fearful that the appropriation bills would not be passed by Saturday night. So I am not in the slightest degree responsible for any order of business, or any adjourning over, or anything of the kind. My entire purpose was to get this bill and every other appropriation bill passed before next Saturday night.

Mr. BARKLEY. I acquit the Senator from Tennessee, because I did not myself talk to him, but when the Senator from New Mexico came and told me that the Senator wanted it to go over, I assumed that he had talked with the Senator and when I asked the Senator if it was agreeable to him and he indicated that nothing could be gained, under the circumstances, by a session Friday, I did not object to its going over. But that is all water over the dam. We do not gain anything by trying to fix responsibility for the fact that we have not passed this bill up to now. We are facing a situation which everyone understands. I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from New Mexico in his willingness to accept my suggestion. I think we might make time now by taking a recess, and therefore that is why I made the motion, and I now renew the motion.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield? Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator

from Mississippi.

Mr. BILBO. Not having had much to say about this question up to the present time, I want to respond to the expression from my good friend the Senator from New Mexico who insisted that others agree to the proposition made by the Senator from Kentucky. I want to make it clear that I am not in a position to do any horse trading at this time. I am under obligation to certain Members of the Senate and of the other House to make this fight, and I am not in position to make any agreement at this time. However, I have agreed to meet with quite a number of my colleagues tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, when we will discuss the Senator's proposition. I want it understood that nothing has been agreed to, but we appreciate the Senator's kindly interest in the matter.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a few remarks?

Mr. BARKLEY. For what purpose? Mr. TAFT. Merely that I may make a statement of my views concerning the present situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield for that purpose. I will not yield for any motion.

Mr. TAFT. I understand.

Mr. President, it seems to me the Senate is not a helpless body. The rule provides the method by which we may bring any measure to a vote. That is a perfectly valid rule. That one or two Members, or a small minority of the Senate, should be able to block an appropriation bill the day before the end of the fiscal

year, is, frankly, outrageous.

I have sympathized with many filibusters, but I have no sympathy with a filibuster that attempts to hold up a general appropriation bill appropriating money for Government agencies and in effect saying, "We will not pass this particular measure, and we will block all money for certain Government agencies until our particular wishes are complied with." I do not think the majority leader ought to be compromising with such a position. It seems to me the Senate has the right to vote on every item in an appropriation bill which at least two-thirds of the membership of the Senate wants to vote on.

Furthermore, I believe that unless a cloture petition is presented today it cannot be voted on until Monday. We will then go over the end of the fiscal year and leave some of the Government agencies without funds. I think that a clo-

ture petition ought to be presented, and if the Senator's motion to take a recess is defeated I propose to present such a petition. That would bring up the measure for vote under cloture on Saturday, and we could dispose of the bill on that day. We have gone on with this idea of compromising day after day, and I see no reason why the Senate should compromise with anyone on the question of whether or not we have the right to vote on a general appropriation bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the sudden enthusiasm of the Senator from Ohio about this subject; but in regard to the matter of cloture. there is a complication involved here in that matter, and the Senator from Ohio and I have discussed that question privately during the day. There is a question of interpretation, as to whether, even if a cloture motion were filed today the Senator from New Mexico could thereafter offer his amendment so that it could be voted upon. I do not want to place the Senator from New Mexico in a situation where he cannot offer his amendment in any form, even in the reduced amount, and because of that, and because of the prospect that we may reach an understanding about the matter. I think the better thing to do now is to recess. If we cannot reach a decision tomorrow and the matter has to go over until Monday, that is only one day beyond Saturday. I hope that will not be the result, but in the interest of speed and in order that we may take no chances on doing the Senator from New Mexico any injustice in connection with offering his amendment, I think we should now recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

I make the motion that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Balley], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Johnson], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]; the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Sentor from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Overton], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], from Oklahoma the Senator THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMASI, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Typings], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. Briggs], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Hatch], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent in Europe visiting battlefields.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Mc-Carran] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent as members of the committee to attend the funeral of the late Senator Scrugham.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah

[Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Van-DENBERG] has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally].

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Buck], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Bushfield], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Harr], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Hawkes], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Moore], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Revercomb], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Smith], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Willey], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Willis] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKEN-LOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Reed], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Shipstead], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Tobey], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Wilson] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. Thomas] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Robertson] is absent on official business by direction of the President pro tempore of the Senate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] is absent on official business of the Senate attending the funeral of the late Senator Scrugham.

The roll call resulted—yeas 19, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS-19

Bankhead Fulbright McFarland George Gerry Barkley McKellar Bilbo Millikin Byrd Hill Radcliffe Hoey Johnston, S. C. Downey Eastland Ellender McClellan NAYS-28

Donnell Mitchell Aiken Ferguson Morse Murdock Ball Green Brewster Brooks Guffey Myers Taft Gurney Tunnell Kilgore La Follette Burton Butler Wagner Capper Chavez Langer Wherry McMahon Mead Cordon

NOT VOTING-48

Shipstead Smith Johnson, Colo. Andrews Bailey Bridges Lucas McCarran Magnuson Taylor Thomas, Idaho Briggs Buck Bushfield Maybank Moore Thomas, Okla. Thomas, Utah Capehart Chandler Connally Tobey Tydings Vandenberg Murray O'Daniel O'Mahoney Glass Hart Overton Pepper Walsh Wheeler White Reed Hatch Wiley Willis Revercomb Robertson Havden Hickenlooper Russell Johnson, Calif. Saltonstall Wilson Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas are 19, the nays are 23. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the roll to establish the presence of a quorum.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names.

Aiken Langer McClellan Downey Austin Ball Bankhead Eastland Ellender McKellar Ferguson Barkley Fulbright McMahon Millikin Bilbo George Gerry Green Brewster Mitchell Brooks Murdock Burton Butler Guffey Myers Radcliffe Gurney Byrd Hill Capper Taft Johnston, S. C. Tunnell Kilgore Wagner La Follette Wherry Chavez Cordon Kilgore La Follette Donnell

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fortyfive Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of absent Sena-

The Chief Clerk called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. MEAD answered to his name when called.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire whether the last call has developed a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has

not so far

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. WILLIS and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado entered the Chamber, and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

BARKLEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President-

The The PRESIDING OFFICER. question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to take a recess. That has never been disposed of.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought it was, but that the announcement had not been made as to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No: there was not a quorum present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I at this time withdraw the motion?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is not in order to withdraw the motion. The motion is still pending.

Mr. BARKLEY. I could withdraw it by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator could withdraw it by unanimous consent. Is there objection to the Senator's request to withdraw his motion to take a recess? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Kentucky is recog-

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a while ago, when we were discussing this proposition, and the Senator from Ohio was seeking to get recognition for the purpose of offering a cloture motion. I made the statement that I did not desire that the Senate take any step which would bar the Senator from New Mexico from the right to offer his amendment if cloture should be ordered and he had not offered it prior to the vote on cloture.

The rule uses language which is not, ordinarily used in regard to offering amendments. We have a practice of Senators sending amendments to the desk and having them read for the information of the Senate, and then have them lie on the table. They may lie there until the vote on the bill is cast and may never be offered, and therefore they are not pending and are never pending unless they are actually offered at the time when they are in order.

Mr. President, the rule provides a little different method, it seems. I should like to read it, and if possible get a ruling of the Chair. It is rule XXII, providing for the closing of debate, and after some preliminary provisions it says:

Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that

The point upon which I should like the Chair to rule is whether, if any Senator, prior to the vote on a motion to close debate sends an amendment to the desk and it is read and lies on the table, if the vote is successful and two-thirds vote in favor of cloture, is that a compliance with the rule that he has presented his amendment and had it read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that it is.

Mr. BARKLEY. That it is a compliance with the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That it is

Mr. BARKLEY. Although the amendment has not been offered actually, because it would not be in order to offer one, under the present circumstances, if any Senator sent an amendment to the desk and had it read. That is a presentation within the meaning of the rule which would entitle him to offer it after the vote is taken, if the vote is successf1112

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Chair rules that if a petition is presented for cloture at any time before Saturday at 1 o'clock, any Senator could present an amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. And that thereafter it would be in order to offer it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for just one question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield. Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It seems to me there is one other question involved which, so far as I can recall, has not been ruled upon. The amendment which the Senator from New Mexico is sponsoring requires a motion to suspend the rule, and it seems to me that we should have a ruling from the Chair as to whether the cloture rule, assuming that two-thirds vote in the affirmative to invoke cloture, would apply to the motion to suspend the rule which must precede the offering of the amendment sponsored by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BANKHEAD. A parliamentary

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky. [Laughter.] Mr. BANKHEAD. I make the inquiry

in the abstract.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President. I desire to make a motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have the floor. Mr. GEORGE. The Senator cannot hold the floor after having made an inquiry of the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not attempting to hold the floor to prevent any Senator from making a motion.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not yield for that

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. I am suggesting the

absence of a quorum. Mr. BARKLEY. I have not yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor at present.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin to propound an interrogatory in regard to the parliamentary situation, upon which the Chair has not ruled. If the Chair is ready to

Mr. GEORGE. The Chair did rule on the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Chair ruled upon the question submitted by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. GEORGE. The Chair ruled on the question, and I made the point of no quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Chair ruled on the question as to whether cloture would apply to a motion to suspend the rule which must be made preceding the offering of the amendment by the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No: the Chair has not ruled on that.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the inquiry which I thought the Chair had ruled upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Chair ruled upon the question submitted by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Wisconsin asked a question. I do not know whether the Chair desires to rule on that now or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not prepared to rule on that just

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield the floor. Mr. GEORGE. I suggest the absence

of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their

Aiken	Ferguson	McMahon
Austin	Fulbright	Mead
Ball	George	Millikin
Bankhead	Green	Mitchell
Barkley	Guffey	Morse
Brewster	Gurney	Murdock
Brooks	Hill	Myers
Burton	Hoey	Radcliffe
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Capper	Kilgore	Taft
Chavez	La Follette	Tunnell
Cordon	Langer	Wagner
Donnell	McFarland	Wherry
Ellender	McKellar	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fortytwo Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The clerk will call the names of absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. East-LAND answered to his name when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fortythree Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. BREWSTER. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. McClellan entered the Chamber and answered to

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is it in order to ask for a report from the Sergeant at Arms relative to the absent Senators?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms is not present at this time. He is out, carrying out his duties under the order of the Senate.

After a little further delay,

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we now have a report from the Sergeant at Arms about the absent Senators?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will report.

The SERGEANT AT ARMS. I have contracted as many Senators as I could, Most of them are not at home. I think three Senators will be here in a short time. In other words, they said they would come. I told them I would come after them, and they said they would come here.

The residences of a number of other Senators have been telephoned, but they have not answered. I have a list here of those who have been telephoned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire how many are needed to make a quorum.

The SERGEANT AT ARMS. Three.

Mr. BARKLEY. If those three keep their word, we shall have a quorum; is that correct?

The SERGEANT AT ARMS. Yes. However, some of them live at Wardman Park Hotel; they are that far from the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is no reason why

they cannot get here.

The SERGEANT AT ARMS. No; of course not. When I said I would come for them, they said they would come without that, and I have taken them at their word.

At 11:25 o'clock p. m. Mr. SMITH entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

At 11:30 o'clock Mr. WILEY entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to compel the attendance of the absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Sanate.

At 11:41 Mr. CAPEHART entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, let me observe that it is now past midnight, and Friday morning has arrived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct; it is a new calendar day

Mr. STEWART. I say, "Good morn-

ing."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Chair also note in the RECORD that all of the Senators who have presented themselves since the order to the Sergeant at Arms was issued have apparently been on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. STEWART. We say to those on the other side of the Chamber, "Good morning." [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. We appreciate the diligence with which those in authority have sought to produce a quorum.

After a little delay,

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, may

we have a report from the Sergeant at

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms is not now in the Chamber. He is absent, enforcing the order of the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. May it be noted in the RECORD that he has been absent onehalf hour in traveling from the Senate Chamber to the Methodist Building and returning. I think it is approximately 100 yards away, across the park.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sergeant at Arms was directed to bring the absent Senators to the Chamber. The Chair believes the Sergeant at Arms is now performing that duty.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe the Sergeant at Arms also has assistants to aid him in the performance of that duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that all of the assistants of the Sergeant at Arms are likewise engaged in endeavoring to locate the absent Senators.

Mr. BREWSTER. It has been a very unsuccessful quest.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I should like to observe that it is now two minutes after midnight.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is a motion to adjourn now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to adjourn is in order at any time. Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask if the 22 Republicans present at this time will constitute a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not now present.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I submit the Senator's inquiry was not a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not advised as to the complexion of the absent Senators.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-

ator will state it.

Mr. HILL. I should like to ask whether, if the Republican leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], together with the chairman of the Republican conference, the Senator from

Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], were present, a sufficient number of Senators would be present to constitute a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Chair is not passing on that proposition. Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILEY. Would it be in order to pour a little oil on the smoldering fire? [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to inquire where the majority leader is. I wonder if we would have a quorum if he were present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He is on the list.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, may I inquire what we are going to do the rest of the night?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is for the Senate to decide at its pleasure. At 12:12 a. m., Friday, June 29, 1945, Mr. O'MAHONEY entered the Chamber

and answered to his name. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fortyeight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, under rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I present a petition and ask that the Chair read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The petition is as follows:

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby to bring to a close the debate upon the bill (H. R. 3368) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The clerk will read the names of Senators who have signed the petition.

The Chief Clerk read the following names:

SHERIDAN DOWNEY, BRIEN McMahon, JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, HARLEY M. KILGORE, HUGH B. MITCHELL, FRANCIS J. MYERS, JAMES M. TUNNELL, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, HOMER E. CAPEHART, ALEXANDER WILEY, ROBERT A. TAFT, WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., HOMER FERGUSON, ROBERT F. WAGNER, C. WAYLAND BROOKS, JOSEPH H. BALL, OWEN BREWSTER, HAROLD H. BURTON, HUGH BUTLER, RAYMOND E. WILLIS, RORREST C. DONNELL, ARTHUR CAPPER, CHAN GURNEY, GUY CORDON, KENNETH S. WHERRY, WARREN R. AUSTIN, GEO. D. AIKEN, WILLIAM LANGER, WAYNE MORSE, ROBERT M. LA FOL-LETTE, Jr., JAS. M. MEAD, DENNIS CHAVEZ.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, did the clerk read my name?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the name of the Senator from Ohio was read.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, did the clerk read my name?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it does not make any difference whose names are signed to the petition if the required number of 16 have signed. That is a sufficient number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are more than the required number.

Mr. BARKLEY. The petition will speak for itself as to who signed it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The petition will be filed under the rules of the Senate, and the clerk will note the time at which the petition was presented.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the petition been officially filed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ordered it filed, and the time has been noted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the time now being a quarter past 12 midnight, we are still operating under the legislative day of last Monday, as I recall. The petition being filed, I inquire when will the Senate be required under the rule to vote upon it? Will it be at 1 o'clock on Saturday or Monday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 1

o'clock p. m. on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. It could not be voted upon earlier than Monday except by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The present calendar day be-

gan 1 minute after 12 o'clock. Mr. BARKLEY. If that is the ruling of the Chair, and I do not question it, in view of the fact that the President of the United States is scheduled to anpear in the Senate next Monday at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, it would be necessary, by unanimous consent to waive that part of the rule which requires the Senate to vote at 1 o'clock. I am sure no Senator wishes to interfere with the program of the President's presentation of the charter which was agreed to in San Francisco. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that the vote upon the cloture motion be taken immediately following the President's appearance and his presentation of the San Fran-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, what is the unanimous-consent request which has been made? I did not understand it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Mississippi understands that the President is to appear in the Senate at 1 o'clock in the afternoon of next Monday.

Mr. BILBO. Yes.
Mr. BARKLEY. Under the rules of
the Senate we would have to vote at 1
o'clock on Monday on the motion which

has been presented. Mr. BILBO. Yes.

cisco Charter.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am asking unanimous consent that the vote upon the petition be taken following the President's appearance in the Senate and his presentation of the San Francisco Charter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield for that purpose.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1 of the bill, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

COMMITTEE ON PAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE

Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary to enable the Committee on Fair Employment Practice to carry out any functions lawfully vested in it by Executive Orders Nos. 8802 and 9346, including salary of a Chairman at not to exceed \$8,000 per annum and six other members at not to exceed \$25 per diem when actually engaged; travel expenses (not to exceed \$63,800); expenses of witnesses in attendance at committee hearings, when necessary; printing

and binding (not to exceed \$4,800); purchase of newspapers and periodicals (not to exceed \$500); not to exceed \$694 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by section 2 of act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364); and the temporary employment of persons, by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws (not to exceed \$8,900); \$446,200: Provided, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay the compensation of any person to initiate, investigate, or prosecute any complaint against any defendant where such defendant does not have the same right to appeal an adverse decision of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice to the President of the United States, or to refer said com-plaint to the President of the United States for final disposition, as is asserted by or allowed the said Committee on Fair Employment Practice in cases where persons complained against refuse to abide by its orders: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the compensation of any person to initiate, investigate, or prosecute any proceedings against any person, firm, or corporation which seeks to effect the seizure or operation of any plant or other property of such person, firm, or corporation by Federal authority for failure to abide by any rule or regulation of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, or for failure to abide by any order passed by the Committee on Fair Employment Practice: Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay the compensation of any person employed by said Committee on Fair Employment Practice who issues or attempts to enforce any rule, regulation, or order which repeals, amends, or modifies any law enacted by the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Chair will understand that earlier in the evening I secured a ruling from the Chair that the presentation and reading of a proposed amendment complied with rule XXII, so that if the cloture motion were adopted by the two-thirds vote necessary it would then be in order to offer the amendment. This presentation and reading of the amendment is in compliance with the Chair's ruling, so as to preserve the right of the Senator from New Mexico to offer the amendment in the event the Senate by the required two-thirds votes to close debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I understand the amendment cannot be offered until after the committee amendments have been acted on. Is that the understanding?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I only wish to preserve the right to offer the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment. Under the parliamentary situation, committee amendments have not yet been disposed of, and no amendment from the floor is in order until they have been disposed of. The presentation of this amendment and its reading complies with the rule, so that the Senator from New Mexico can offer it in the event the Senate votes by two-thirds majority to close debate.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield? Mr. McCLELLAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I take it that what has been read does not change the par-

liamentary situation. If it does, I want to know what the change is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will announce that the RECORD will show that the Senator from New Mexico presented the amendment, that it was read, and that it now lies upon the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. And may be offered by him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The amendment is now on the table, and not before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not before the Senate, but can be offered at the proper time after committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. TAFT. I think it will be necessary also to offer all the committee amendments which have not yet been consid-

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, they may be presented and read at any time before we are required, under the rule, to vote, which would be 1 o'clock on Monday, or following the President's appearance here. Tomorrow and Saturday the committee could present its amendments under the rule, and have them read, so that we could vote upon them after a vote on the motion of the Senator from Ohio to close debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that committee amendments have been offered and will be offered, and will be urged at every possible moment.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a matter of fact, they are already before the Senate, and will be taken up in their order prior to the vote on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be first in order, to be followed by others.

Mr. STEWART. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STEWART. The motion for cloture having just been filed affects only the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only the bill, and amendments which may be offered.

Mr. STEWART. The rule, as I understand it, provides that it affects the pending measure. Rule XXII provides:

If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That has been done.

Mr. STEWART. The motion is to close the debate upon the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending measure.

Mr. STEWART. What is the pending measure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending measure is the appropriation bill, together with the committee amendments, and with the amendment presented by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. STEWART. This is the inquiry I wish to propound. How can the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico be a portion of the pending business affected by the cloture motion when

it requires a two-thirds majority to place that amendment on this bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Chair will permit, I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that the proposal for closing debate applies to the pending measure, that is, the appropriation bill and all amendments thereto, and all amendments thereto must be presented and read prior to the vote on the motion.

Mr. STEWART. I do not so under-

Mr. BARKLEY. The question whether the two-thirds requirement for suspension of the rule would still be applicable was presented to the Chair earlier in the evening, and the Chair was not prepared to rule. I might say that I do not think that the adoption of the cloture rule would abrogate the requirement of the two-thirds rule insofar as an amendment otherwise not in order is con-cerned, because the two-thirds rule applies to an amendment otherwise not in order, and on a motion to suspend the rule, so that the two-thirds rule would still apply, even after the cloture vote. to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. STEWART. Then the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico cannot be considered until after the vote on the cloture motion has been dis-

posed of?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct, and if a point of order should be made it could not be considered, except after a motion to suspend the rule, which would have to be carried by two-thirds vote.

Mr. STEWART. A motion to suspend the rule is necessary in order to consider

the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the cloture motion does not interfere with the rule of the Senate requiring that a suspension of the rule requires a two-

thirds vote.

Mr. STEWART. Suspension of the rule, of course, is necessary, because the proposed amendment would be legislation on an appropriation bill. I quite understand that. But there is a distinction between the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico and committee amendments, which must be adopted by a mere majority. Of course, the same majority is required to suspend the rule to make it possible to adopt the motion of the Senator from New Mexico, as is required to adopt the cloture motion, namely, two-thirds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only purpose in filing the amendment by the Senator from New Mexico now is to comply with rule XXII. It does not change

anything else.

Mr. STEWART. I do not yet understand why it is necessary for the Senator from New Mexico to offer his amendment

at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I might clarify that situation, inasmuch as the Chair has ruled that the motion to close debate cannot be voted on until Monday, any Senator who has an amendment to offer to the bill, who presents the amendment and has it read prior to the time the vote is taken on Monday, will be in order if he offers his amendment after the vote, provided it does not violate the rule that requires a two-thirds vote, and

in the event it does require a two-thirds vote, we have to vote upon it as if the cloture motion had not been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a correct statement of the rule.

Mr. STEWART. If I understand the situation correctly, an amendment not offered at this time cannot be considered.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. If the Senator has an amendment to the pending bill he can offer it tonight, or tomorrow, or Saturday and have it read, and it will lie on the table, and he can bring it up at any time after the vote on the question of cloture.

Mr. STEWART. I will ask the Chair to bear with me while I read the concluding portion of rule XXII:

Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the pending measure—

Which is, as I understand it, after we have voted on the cloture motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. If there is a twothirds vote, no Senator can speak more than 1 hour.

Mr. STEWART. The rule continues: the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time.

It is in order to comply with that provision, as I understand it, that the Senator from New Mexico offered his amendment at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator could have offered it tomorrow or on Saturday, because the Chair has ruled that the vote will be taken on Monday.

Mr. STEWART. So far it is partially clear, at least. The rule continues:

No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order.

May I inquire of the Chair if that means that such amendments shall not be in order at this time, or not in order after the vote on the cloture?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the vote on cloture.

Mr. STEWART. The rule as to germaneness would not apply then to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico which has just been read from the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would not say that. The Chair is not prepared to rule on that proposition yet. The question has not yet come up.

Mr. STEWART. It seems to me that is a matter which could be disposed of—possibly not at this time but at the proper time, and I propound that as a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not decide questions of relevancy. They are determined by the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. But, of course, the question must be submitted to the Senate

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, is it not true with respect to an amendment offered not by a committee but by an individual Senator that a two-thirds majority is required to waive the rule before it can be acted on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not every amendment. That applies only to amendments which are contrary to the provisions of rule XVI.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it is an amendment that increases an appropriation or provides for an appropriation not in the bill the two-thirds rule would apply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be an amendment contrary to rule XVI.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct. I think, Mr. President, the situation is now made clear.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, a par-

liamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BURTON. I wish merely to inquire, in order to make sure that I understand the nature of the procedure after cloture, whether the limitation on debate takes effect after the vote on next Monday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does. Mr. BURTON. And therefore between now and next Monday we may proceed in the usual manner, and it may be that the whole thing may be disposed of in the usual manner without all the procedure which has been under discussion, and we may get it all over by tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, Mr. President, I express the further hope that we may be able to dispose of the whole problem before we have to vote on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Taft].

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 44) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government," reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 447) thereon.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. BARKLEY introduced a bill (S. 1208) to authorize the President to appoint Gen. Omar N. Bradley to the office of Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, without affecting his military status and perquisites, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry aviators and citizens to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Lester J. Williams, to be postmaster at Canastota, N. Y.

By Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on the Library:

Luther H. Evans, of Texas, to be Librarian of Congress:

Schwabe, Okla.

Thomas, N. J.

Shafer

Short

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 33 minutes a. m. Friday, June 29, 1945), the Senate took a recess until 12 o'clock noon today.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m. The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord and Master, Thou who hast glorified all that is of earth and sea and sky, to Thee we offer our tribute of praise. On Thee we base our comfort and our hope and rejoice that our faith is not in vain. By our awareness of Thy presence, we pray Thee to reveal unto us the hidden things of the soul by which despondency is relieved through the

ministry of the spirit.

Almighty God, the source of all life and power, bring honor, peace, and brotherhood to this weary earth. Whatever hinders concord among the nations, grant that we may see the beginning of a new day in which righteous and just achievement shall overcome unrighteous ambitions; then we shall behold the frui-tion of the prophetic vision: "Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle tree, and it shall be unto the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off." We pray for Heaven's blessing to be on our President and all his immediate advisers. In the name of Him who is the Light of the World, Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will

state it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I wish to ask if the previous question is pending on the second deficiency appropriation bill

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And is the unfinished business and the first order of business today.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the passage of the bill (H. R. 3579) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years; to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946; to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946; and for other purposes.

The question is on the passage of the

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were-ayes 318, nays 14, not voting 102, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

	[2001 210. 220]	
	AYES-318	
	Elston	Kerr
Adams	Engel, Mich.	Kilday
Allen, Ill. Allen. La.	Ervin	King Kinzer
Andersen,	Fallon Feighan	Kirwan
H Carl	Flonton	Knutson
Anderson, Calif.	Fernandez	Kopplemann
andresen,	risner	Kunkel
August H. Andrews, Ala.	Flannagan	Landis
andrews, Ala.	Flood	Latham
Andrews, N. Y. Angell	Fogarty Forand	Lea LeCompte
Arends	Fulton	LeFevre
Bailey	Gallagher	Lemke
Baldwin, Md.	Gamble	Lewis
Barrett, Pa.	Gardner	Link
Bates, Ky.	Gary	Luce
Bates, Mass. Beail	Gathings Gavin	Ludlow Lyle
Beckworth	Gearhart	McConnell
Bennett, Mo.	Geelan	McCormack
Biemiller	Gerlach	McCowen
Bishop	Gibson	McDonough
Blackney	Gifford	McGehee
Bland	Gillespie	McGlinchey
Bolton Bonner	Gillette Gillie	McGregor McKenzie
Boren	Goodwin	McMillan, S. C.
Boykin	Gordon	McMillen, Ill.
Brehm	Gore	Madden
Brooks	Gorski	Mahon
Brown, Ga.	Gossett	Maloney
Brown, Ohio Braumbaugh	Graham	Manasco
Bryson	Granahan Grant, Ala.	Mansfield, Mont.
Buck	Green	Mansfield, Tex.
Bulwinkle	Gregory	Marcantonio
Burch	Griffiths	Martin, Mass.
Burgin	Gross	Mason
Camp	Gwinn, N. Y.	May
Campbell Canfield	Gwynne, Iowa Hagen	Michener Miller, Calif.
Cannon, Mo.	Hale	Miller, Nebr.
Carlson	Halleck	Mills
Carnahan	Hancock	Monroney
Case, N. J.	Hand	Morgan
Case, S. Dak.	Hare	Morrison
Chapman Chelf	Harless, Ariz. Harness, Ind.	Mott Mundt
Chenoweth	Harris	Murdock
Church	Hartley	Murphy Murray, Tenn. Murray, Wis.
Clark	Havenner	Murray, Tenn.
Clements	Healy	Murray, Wis.
Cochran	Hedrick	Aicery
Coffee Cole, Mo.	Henry	Norrell O'Brien TI
Colmer	Herter Heselton	O'Brien, Ill. O'Brien, Mich.
Combs	Hess	O'Konski
Cooper	Hill	O'Neal
Corbett	Hinshaw	O'Toole
Courtney	Hoch	Outland
Cox Crosser	Hoeven Holmes, Mass.	Pace Patman
Cunningham	Holmes, Wash.	Patrick
Curley	Норе	Patterson
Curtis	Horan	Peterson, Fla.
D'Alesandro	Howell	Peterson, Ga.
Daughton, Va.	Huber	Philbin
Davis	Hull	Phillips
De Lacy Delaney,	Jackson	Pickett Plumley
John J.	Jenkins	Poage
D'Ewart	Jennings	Powers
Dirksen	Jensen	Priest
Dolliver	Johnson, Ill.	Rabaut
Domengeaux	Johnson,	Rabin
Dondero Doughton N. C.	Luther A.	Ramey Ramspeck
Douglas, Calif.	Johnson, Okla. Jonkman	Randolph
Douglas, Ill.	Kean	Rankin
Doyle	Kee	Reed, Ill.
Drewry	Keefe	Reed, Ill.
Durham Eberharte r	Kefauver Kelley Po	Reed, N. Y. Rees, Kans.
Elliott	Kelley, Pa. Kelly, Ill.	Resa Rans.
Ellsworth	Keogh	Richards
NAME OF TAXABLE PARTY.	Editorial Lines	CONTRACTOR OF THE

ivers	Snyder	Trimble
izlev	Sparkman	Vinson
obertson.	Spence	Voorhis, Calif.
N. Dak.	Springer	Vorys, Ohio
obinson, Utah		Vursell
obsion, Ky.	Stefan	Wasielewski
ockwell	Stewart	Weaver
oe, Md.	Stockman	Weichel
ogers, Fla.	Sullivan	Weiss
ogers, Mass.	Sumners, Tex.	Welch
ogers, N. Y.	Sundstrom	West
ooney	Taber	White
yter	Talbot	Whittington
abath	Talle	Wigglesworth
avage	Tarver	Winstead
crivner	Thomas, Tex.	Wolcott
heridan	Thomason	Wolfenden, Pa
mpson. Ill.	Tibbott	Wolverton, N.
laughter	Tolan	Wood
mith, Maine	Torrens	Woodhouse
mith, Va.	Towe	Woodrum, Va.
mith, Wis.	Traynor	Zimmerman
	NAYS-14	

R

RRR

RRR

RSSSS

SISI

S

Arnold

Buffett

Clevenger

Dworshak

Barrett, Wyo.

Schwabe, Mo. NOT VOTING-102

Jones

O'Hara

Pittenger

Anderson,	Folger	Powell
N. Mex.	Fuller	Price, Fla.
Auchineless	Granger	Price, Ill.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Grant, Ind.	Quinn, N. Y.
Barden	Hall.	Rains
Barry	Edwin Arthur	
Bell	Hall.	Rich
Bender	Leonard W.	Riley
Bennet, N. Y.	Hart	Robertson, Va.
Bloom	Hays	Rodgers, Pa.
Bradley, Mich.	Hébert	Roe, N. Y.
Bradley, Pa.	Heffernan	Rowan
Buckley	Hendricks	Russell
Bunker	Hobbs	Sadowski
Butler	Hoffman	Sasscer
Byrne, N. Y.	Holifield	Sharp
Byrnes, Wis.	Hook	Sheppard
Cannon, Fla.	Jarman	Sikes
Celler	Johnson, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Ohio
Clason	Johnson,	Somers, N. Y.
Cole, Kans.	Lyndon B.	Stevenson
Cole, N. Y.	Judd	Stigler
Cooley	Kearney	Sumner, Ill.
Cravens	Kilburn	Taylor
Crawford	LaFollette	Thom
Dawson	Lane	Wadsworth
Delaney.	Lanham	Walter
James J.	Larcade	Whitten
Dickstein	Lesinski	Wickersham
Dingell	Lynch	Wilson
Earthman	Martin, Iowa	Winter
Eaton	Merrow	Woodruff, Mich.
Elsaesser	Norton	Worley
Engle, Calif.	Pfeifer	

So the bill was passed.

Ploeser

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Fellows

Mr. Walter with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Clason.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Quinn of New York with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Riley with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Fuller. Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Elsaesser. Mr. Bunker with Mr. Bradley of Michigan. Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. LaFollette.

Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Bloom with Mr. Kilburn,

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Ploeser. Mr. Holifield with Mr. Martin of Iowa, Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Grant of Indiana. Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Rowan with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Fellows. Mr. Rayfiel with Mr. Hoffman.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Woodruff of Michi-

Mr. Barry with Mr. Sundstrom.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Cole of New York. Mr. Cravens with Mr. Auchincloss.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize Members to extend their remarks but prefers not to recognize Members who ask to speak for 1 minute.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on July 5 the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Hill] may address the House for 30 minutes after the legislative business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mas-

sachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record on the resignation of the Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, on November 28, 1944, I took a minute on the floor of this House to congratulate President Roosevelt on his good judgment in selecting Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., as his new Secretary of State. Passing events have demonstrated that the President chose wisely and well in making that selection.

I regret that the exigencies of politics have now impelled President Truman to accept the resignation of Mr. Stettinius on almost the very day marking his crowning achievement of steering the San Francisco Conference through to a harmonious and promising conclusion.

In my opinion, had the President continued him as Secretary of State, Ed Stettinius would have become one of the greatest and most distinguished statesmen ever to serve this country in that

In the short 6 months he has been permitted to serve, he has gone far in reorganizing and revitalizing the State Department; he has created an almost unprecedented relationship of friendly consultations between his Department and Congress; he has added efficiency to a Department which normally specializes only in diplomacy; and he has demonstrated a unique capacity for winning friends and influencing human behavior in his conferences and negotiations with foreign statesmen. The Act of Chapultepec and the San Francisco Conference are lasting tributes to his energy and

As the United States representative on the World Security Council he will have further opportunities to exemplify his capacity for leadership. I predict that he will meet them well and I congratulate him upon his decision to remain in the public service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of lend-lease and to include a newspaper item from the Times-Herald of today; also to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include a communication from a CIO organization at Ely, Minn., and also to extend his remarks in the Record and to include a communication from the Federated Trade and Labor Assembly of Duluth, Minn., the latter two communications dealing with the OPA.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from R. L. Hudson, chairman of Rationing Board, No. 76, of Pocahontas County, Iowa, and to include a newspaper statement about the rationing of canning sugar

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record on renegotiation of contracts, and so forth, and to include a letter written by a businessman.

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include certain material with each of them.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include a letter.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on July 6 after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement

of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3024) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 4, 26, 33, 35, 36, 37, 41, 51, 58½, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104, 105, 106, 108, 131, 136, 138, 148, 149, 150, 152, 167, 168, 170, 173, 186, 188, 193, 194, 195, 197, 200, 201, 202, 212, 213, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 246, 249, 252, 262, 266, 269, 282, 285, 302, 307, 309, 310, 312, 314, 318, and 319.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 12, 13, 23, 30, 32, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 53, 55, 62, 63, 112, 117, 122, 124, 127, 128, 137, 161, 166, 179, 184, 199, 208, 209, 210, 218, 254, 271, 281, 284, 292½, 299, 301, 303, 315, 316, and 317, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,079,-740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$118,-980"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$86,626"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,200,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$12,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$203,-860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$212,-500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,600,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by the said amendment insert the following: "twelve"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$105,-950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Appropriations herein made for the Grazing Service for 'Salaries and expenses', 'Range improvements', and 'Fire fighting' shall be available for the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$450,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "fifteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$354,-695"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$310,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$150,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows; In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "one hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$600,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$250,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Sanate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$125,-000"; and the Sanate agree to the same.

000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$125,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$125,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$341,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$87,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$566,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66; and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$310,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1.414,-910"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$37,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$80,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$170,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 118: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 118, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$99,985"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$30,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$8,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 130: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"The following appropriations herein made for the Indian Service shall be available for hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft: 'Administration of Indian forests'; 'Suppressing forest fires on Indian reservations'; 'Education of natives of Alaska'; 'Medical relief of natives of Alaska'; and 'Reindeer service, Alaska'."

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 132: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "two hundred and eighty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 133: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft with funds provided for 'General investigations' and the 'Missouri River Basin', and all sums appropriated in this Act to such Bureau shall be available for such hire, maintenance, and operation to meet unforeseen emergencies due to fire, flood or storm;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 139: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 139, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$121,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 141: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 142: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$67,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Ten"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 144: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 144, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure stricken out and the figure inserted by said amendment, insert the following figure: "10"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,000,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 151: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 151, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 153: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,000,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,050,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 162: That the House

Amendment numbered 162: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 162, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$349,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 169: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 171: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 171, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,000,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 172: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 172, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,000,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 174: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 174, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 175: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 175, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$17,275,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,200,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 180: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$112,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$95,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "thirty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 185: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and purchase (not to exceed \$10,000) of office furniture and equipment for use in the District of Columbia in addition to that which may be purchased

from the appropriation for contingent expenses of the Department;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,146,-560"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 189: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$356,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 190: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 190, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$263,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,187,-500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 192: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$466,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 196: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 196, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,795,-800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 198: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 203: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 203, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$101,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 204: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 204, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$404,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 205: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 205, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$7,313,-760"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 206: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 206, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$70,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 207: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 207, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$165,-700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 211: That the House

Amendment numbered 211: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 211, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,004,-860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 215: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 215, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 216: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 216, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$83,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 220: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 220, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 221: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 221, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$7,000,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 230: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Zenate numbered 230, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 231: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 231, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,250,-000": and the Senate agree to the same.

000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 234: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 234, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu o fthe sum proposed insert "\$16,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 235: That the House

Amendment numbered 235; That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 235, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$450,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 239: That the House

Amendment numbered 239: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 239, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$29,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 240: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 240, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$650,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 247: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 247, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,100,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 255: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 255, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$468,-\$90"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 256: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 256, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$323,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

000"; and the Senate agree to the same. Amendment numbered 259: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 259, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$411,-900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 261: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 261, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$160,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 263: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 263, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$68,512"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 267: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 267, and agree to the same with an amendment, as

follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert

"\$115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.
Amendment numbered 272: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 272, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", including traveling expenses,";

and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 273: That the
House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 273, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert

"\$206,190"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 274: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 274, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$27,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 276: That the

House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 276, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert '\$1,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the

Amendment numbered 277: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 277, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$511,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 283: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 283, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$624,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 286: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 286, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$181,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 288: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 288, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert \$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 289: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 289, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 290: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 290, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "two"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 291: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 291, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$142,585"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 292: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 292, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$625,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 293: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 293, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$55,100"; and the Senate agreed to the same

Amendment numbered 294: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 294, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,219,325"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 295: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 295, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the

Amendment numbered 296: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 296, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,219,325"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 297: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 297, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$704,828"; and the Senate agree to the same. Amendment numbered 298: That the

House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 298, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "seventy-two"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 303: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 303, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,038,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 304: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 304, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted said amendment, insert the following:

by said amendment, insert the following appropriations herein made shall be available for the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft: 'Salaries and expenses, Governor and secretary, Territory of Alaska; 'Construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska'; 'Recon-struction and improvement of Richardson Highway, Alaska'; and 'Alaska Railroad ap-propriated fund'."

And the Senate agree to the same. Amendment numbered 305: That the House

recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 305, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$196,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 313: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 313, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount named in said amendment insert "\$300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in dis-The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 11, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 50, 57, 61, 64, 65, 103, 107, 114, 115, 121, 123, 125, 129, 134, 135, 140, 145, 147½, 154, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 164, 165, 176, 177, 178½, 181, 214, 217, 219, 221½, 222, 228, 229, 232, 233, 236, 237, 238, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 248, 250, 251, 253, 257, 258, 260, 264, 265, 268, 270, 275, 278, 279, 280, 287, 300, 806, 311, 320, and 321 806, 311, 320, and 321.

JED JOHNSON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, W. F. NORRELL, JOHN J. ROONEY, ROBERT F. JONES, BEN F. JENSEN, HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN, KENNETH MCKELLAR, ELMER THOMAS, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, CHAN GURNEY, HAROLD H. BURTON. KENNETH S. WHERRY Managers on the Part of the Senate. STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill, H. R. 3024, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: Appropriates \$1,079,740 for salaries, office of the secretary, instead of \$1,064,140, as proposed by the House, and \$1,130,200, as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$15,600 in the House bill is to provide \$8,200 for three employees in the office of the Budget and \$7,400 for two positions in the office of the Safety Engineer.

No. 2: Appropriates \$210,926 for personal services, office of the Solicitor, instead of \$220,700, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 3: Appropriates \$118,980 for personal services, Division of Territories and Island Possessions, instead of \$112,440, as proposed by the House and \$142,920, as proposed by

No. 4: Appropriates \$173,212, as proposed the House, instead of \$195,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and expenses, Petroleum Conservation Division.

Nos. 6, 7, and 8, relating to soil and moisture conservation operations: Provides \$86,-626 for departmental personal services, instead of \$86,000, as proposed by the House, and \$92,000, as proposed by the Senate; permits the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates \$1,200,000 for all purposes, instead of \$1,056,882, as proposed by the House, and \$1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 9 and 10: Provides \$12,500 for payment of awards, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates \$208,-860 for contingent expenses, instead of \$189,-960, as proposed by the House, and \$224,500, as proposed by the Senate. The reduction of \$15,640 in the bill as passed by the Senate is due to the denial of \$1,500 for the law library, \$3,740 for the Division of Budget and Administrative Management, \$8,500 in connection with the suggestions system, \$200 for the Grazing Service, and \$1,700 for supplies, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Nos. 12 and 13, relating to the High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, provides for the purchase of three automobiles, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates \$278 .-900 for maintenance of the office of the High Commissioner, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$200,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 15, relating to the Office of Fishery Coordination: Appropriates \$212,500 for salaries and expenses, instead of \$200,000, as proposed by the House, and \$225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 18, relating to the Solid Fuels Administration for War: Appropriates \$3,600,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of \$3,500,000, as

proposed by the House, and \$3,730,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 20, 23, 24, and 25, relating to the Grazing Service: Authorizes the purchase of 12 automobiles, instead of 10, as proposed by the House, and 17, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes "construction and purchase" in connection with range improvements, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$105,950 for range improvements, instead of \$80,000, as proposed by the House, and \$200,000, as proposed by the Senate; and authorizes the use of appropriations to the Grazing Service for hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

No. 26: Appropriates \$735,070 for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, instead of \$765,500, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 27: Appropriates \$450,000 for surveying public lands, instead of \$430,750, as proposed by the House, and \$500,000, as proposed

by the Senate.

Nos. 28 and 29: Authorizes the purchase of 15 automobiles, instead of 10, as proposed by the House, and 20, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates \$354,695 for salaries and expenses, branch of field examination, instead of \$346,395, as proposed by the House, and \$463,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 30: Appropriates \$237,000 for salaries and expenses of land offices, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$235,875, as proposed

by the House.

No. 31: Appropriates \$310,000 for timber operations on the Oregon and California grant lands, instead of \$296,000, as proposed by the House, and \$317,500, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 32: Authorizes "construction and purchase" in connection with range improvements on public lands, as proposed by the

Nos. 33 and 34: Appropriates \$150,000 for fire protection and timber management, instead of \$137,045, as proposed by the House, and \$175,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which \$18,000 is made available for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, instead of \$20,220, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

No. 35, relating to departmental personal services: Appropriates \$691.760 for such purpose, as proposed by the House, instead of \$791,760, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 36: Appropriates \$80,900 for travel and

other expenses of departmental employees, as proposed by the House, instead of \$90,287,

as proposed by the Senate.

No. 37: Appropriates \$272,600 for maintaining law and order on Indian reservations, as proposed by the House, instead of \$291,-500, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 38: Authorizes the purchase of 100 automobiles for the Indian Service, instead of 50, as proposed by the House, and 250, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 39 and 40: Clarifies the text of the paragraph relating to the purchase and lease

of lands, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 41: Strikes out the provision of the
Senate appropriating \$100,000 for the acquisition of lands in the Turtle Mountain Reservation in the State of North Dakota.

No. 42: Appropriates \$600,000 for agriculture and stock raising, instead of \$579,545, as proposed by the House, and \$680,800, as proposed by the Senate. The sum of \$7,310 for classification of ungraded positions has

been specifically disallowed.

Nos. 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, and 49, relating to the revolving loan fund for Indians: Corrects United States Code references, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates \$250,-000 for such purpose, instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the House, and \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that \$125,-000 shall be available for administrative expenses, instead of \$110,000, as proposed by the House, and \$140,000, as proposed by the

Senate.

No. 51: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to insert \$20,500 for expenses of the National Indian Institute of the United

Nos. 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56, relating to the San Carlos irrigation project, Arizona: Appropriates \$125,000 from operation and maintenance collections, instead of \$117,585, as proposed by the House, and \$135,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$216,500 from power revenues, as proposed by the Sen-ate, instead of \$193,800 as proposed by the House; and corrects the total of the items in the paragraph accordingly.

Nos. 58, 58½, 59, 60, 62, and 63, relating to construction, repair, and rehabilitation of Indian irrigation systems: Appropriates \$87,-

500 for the Colorado River project, Arizona, instead of \$175,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the provision of the Senate proposing an appropriation of \$8,500 for the Standing Rock project in North Da-kota; appropriates \$115,000 for surveys, in-vestigations, and so forth, instead of \$90,000, as proposed by the House, and \$190,000 as proposed by the Senate; corrects the total amount of such items; and provides for the use interchangeably of not more than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated for projects, as proposed by the Senate, instead of 5 percent, as proposed by the House.

No. 66: Appropriates \$310,000 for lease, purchase, and repair of buildings at Indian schools not otherwise provided for, instead of \$299,000, as proposed by the House, and \$320,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, and 101, relating to Indian nonreservation boarding schools: Eliminates, as proposed by the House, a total of \$30,147 inserted by the Senate, to provide funds for the classification of ungraded Indian positions.

Nos. 102 and 104: Appropriates \$1,414,910 for support, education, and relief of natives in Alaska, instead of \$1,374,910, as proposed by the House, and \$1,584,750, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of \$40,000 in the House figure being allowed for the furnishing of school lunches to native school children. The proposal of the Senate to authorize the transfer by the Secretary of War to the Secretary of the Interior of War Department facilities at Fort Raymond, Seward, Alaska, for school purposes, has been deferred.

No. 105: Appropriates \$5,085,965 for conervation of health, as proposed by the House, instead of \$5,309,600, as proposed by the Sen-

No. 106: Appropriates \$844,150 for medical instead of \$866,500, as proposed by the Sen-

No. 108: Appropriates \$2,791,410, as proposed by the House, instead of \$3,120,550, as proposed by the Senate, for general support and administration of Indian property, all increases proposed by the Senate being elimi-nated, and a reduction of \$4,800 proposed by the Senate in connection with the elimination of an attorney, being restored to the bill.

Nos. 109, 110, 111, and 112, relating to relief and rehabilitation of Indians: Appropriates \$375,000, instead of \$200,000, as proposed by the House, and \$739,700, as proposed by the enate; provides that \$37,500 shall be available for administrative expenses, instead of \$25,000, as proposed by the House, and \$72,-000, as proposed by the Senate, of which \$15,-000 is made available for departmental services, instead of \$10,000, as proposed by the House, and \$29,000, as proposed by the Senate; the limitation of \$40,000 on rehabilitation of needy Indians being eliminated with the understanding that appropriations provided under this item shall be used for relief pur-porposes and not for construction.

No. 113: Appropriates \$680,000 for the Alaska reindeer service, instead of \$77,180, as proposed by the House, and \$85,800, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 116: Appropriates \$170,000 for administration of Indian tribal affairs, instead of \$160,000, as proposed by the House, and \$183,-050, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 117: Appropriates \$206,530 for support of the Klamath Agency, Oreg., as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$199,030, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 118, 119, and 120: Appropriates \$99,-985 for support of the Menominee Agency, instead of \$92,985, as proposed by the House, and \$106,985, as proposed by the Senate; provides that \$30,000 shall be for relief of needy Indians, instead of \$25,000, as proposed by the House, and \$35,000, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that \$8,000 shall be available for payment of salaries and expenses, instead of \$5,000, as proposed by the House, and \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 122: Provides \$5,000 for improvement

of Choctaw buildings and grounds, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 124: Appropriates \$177,140, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$172,640, as proposed by the House, to provide funds for an Osage tribal attorney.

No. 126: Appropriates \$25,000 for expenses of tribal councils, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the House, and \$35,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos 127 and 128: Strikes out the date of approval of a contract for an attorney for the Colorado River Tribe, Arizona, proposed by the House, and inserts the "to be", as proposed by the Senate, the contract to be approved at a future date.

No. 130: Provides, as proposed by the Sen-ate, that certain appropriations to the Indian Service shall be available for hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, amended to eliminate the extension of such authority in connection with the appropriation "Administration of Indian property.'

No. 131: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate providing that hereafter certain appropriations shall remain available for two fiscal years following the fiscal year for which

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Nos. 132, 133, and 136, relating to administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of two hundred and eighty automobiles, instead of seventy-five, as proposed by the House, and four hundred end eighty-five, as proposed by the Senate; amends the proposal of the Senate making all appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation available for the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft so that only appropriations for "General in-vestigations" and the "Missouri River Basin" shall be available, except that all appropria-tions to the Bureau shall be available to meet unforeseen emergencies due to fire, flood, or storm; and strikes out the proposal of the Senate that certain appropriations to the Bureau shall be available for two fiscal years following the fiscal year for which

Nos. 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, relating to appropriations from the reclamation fund: Authorizes the use of \$420,000 from power revenues for operation of the Parker Dam power project, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$350,000, as proposed by the House, appropriates \$200,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$210,000, as proposed by the Senate, for operation and maintenance of the Owyhee project; appropriates \$121,000 for operation and maintenance of the Klamath project, instead of \$116,000, as proposed by the House, and \$126,000, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the use of \$140,000 from power revenues for operation and maintenance of the power system, Kendrick project, instead of \$135,000, as proposed by the House, and \$144,-000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$67,750 for operation and maintenance, Riverton project, instead of \$65,500, as proposed by the House and \$70,000, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the interchange of appropriations for operation and maintenance to the extent of 10 percent of such amounts, instead of 5, as proposed by the House, and 15, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$3,000,000 for salaries and expenses, other than for project offices, instead of \$2,500,000, as proposed by the House, and \$4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$550,000 for continuation of construction of the Gila project, instead of \$500,000, as proposed by the House, and \$950,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$800,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate. The action of the conferees in eliminating funds for the proposed trans-mission from Brush to the Sterling Hol-yoke area in Colorado was taken because it

was the opinion of the conferees that this line should be constructed with funds loaned by the Rural Electrification Administration rather than with funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation, and the conferees so recommend. Appropriates \$450,000 for the Palisades project, as proposed by the House, instead of \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$60,000 for the Sun River project, as proposed by the House, instead of \$66,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$200,000 for the Hungry Horse project, instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the House, and \$475,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$450,000 for the Deschutes project, as proposed by the House, instead of \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates \$2,000,000 for the Provo River project, instead of \$1,750,000, as proposed by the House, and \$2,219,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 157: Authorizes the use of not to exceed \$1,050,000 from revenues for operation and maintenance of the Boulder Canyon project, instead of \$1,000,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,100,000, as proposed by the

Nos. 161, 162, and 163, relating to the Colorado River Development Fund: Appropriates \$500,000 for plans and investigations in connection with the Colorado River system, instead of \$400,000, as proposed by the House, and \$900,250, as proposed by the Senate; of which \$150,250 is made available for studies in connection with a plan for utilization of waters of the Colorado River, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$120,250, as proposed by the House; and \$349,750 for investigations of projects for such utilization in the four States of the upper division, instead of \$279,750, as proposed by the House, and \$750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 166. Provides that the appropriation heretofore made for the Davis Dam project shall be available for construction of Davis-Parker substation and interconnecting trans-

No. 167. Appropriates \$4,500,000 for the Central Valley project, California, as proposed by the House, instead of \$4,715,300, including \$215,300 for plans for a steam plant and transmission lines, as proposed by the Sen-The action of the conferees in the elimination of funds for plans for a steam plant and transmission lines in connection with the Central Valley project, California, was taken in view of the fact that there is an agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. whereby their power is pooled for the period of the war and a reasonable time thereafter which provides for the recapture, without prejudice, of any temporary advantage to either party. In view of this situation the conferees are of the opinion that the existing arrangements should be retained without projudice to those in favor of or opposed to the construction of a steam plant or transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation.

No. 168: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$300,000 for plans, specifications and other work in connection with the Kings River project, California. The amendment was eliminated because, in the opinion of the conferees, the require-ments of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to this project under sections 5 and 8 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887) should be held in abeyance during the continuance of the existing emergency.

No. 169: Appropriates \$450,000 for the San Luis Valley project, Colorado, instead of \$400,000, as proposed by the House, and \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 170: Appropriates \$3,000,000 for the Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch, instead of \$3,041,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 171: Appropriates \$2,000,000 for the Tucumcari project, New Mexico, instead of \$1,400,000, as proposed by the House, and \$2,500,000, as proposed by the Senate. No. 172: Appropriates \$1,000,000 for the

Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, instead of

\$600,000, as proposed by the House, and

\$1,300,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 173: Appropriates \$6,000,000 for the Columbia Basin project, Washington, as proposed by the House, instead of \$8,332,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 174: Appropriates \$325,000 for the Yakima project, Washington, Roza division, instead of \$300,000, as proposed by the House, and \$350,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 175: Corrects a total.

Nos. 178 and 179: Appropriates \$3,200,000 for the Missouri River Basin, for surveys, investigations, and so forth, instead of \$1,440,-000, as proposed by the House, and \$4,680,000, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the proposal of the House that no part of the appropriation shall be available for transfer to other bureaus of the Department, as proposed by the Senate. Two hundred thousand dollars of the amount recommended is for transfer to the Bureau of Mines for work in connection with manganese in the Chamberlain, S. Dak., area.

Nos. 180 and 182: Appropriates \$112,500 for the Colorado River front work and levee system, of which \$95,000 may be used for the purchase of lands, instead of \$100,000, of which \$85,000 might be used for such latter purpose, as proposed by the House, instead of \$125,000, of which \$100,000 would be available for such purpose, as proposed by the Senate.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Nos. 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, and 205, relating to the Geological Survey: Authorizes the purchase of 30 automobiles, instead of 10, as proposed by the House, and 50, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the purchase of not to exceed one, and the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, as proposed by the Senate; amends the proposal of the Senate to auuse of \$10,000 from available thorize the funds for purchase of office furniture and equipment; appropriates \$208,160 for salaries and expenses in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, instead of \$252,000. proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$2,146,560 for topographic surveys, instead of \$2,046,560, as proposed by the House, and \$2,775,000 as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the proposal of the Senate making \$100,-000 of such sum immediately available; provides that not to exceed \$356,000 of such sum may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of \$350,000, as proposed by the House, and \$415,000 as proposed by the Senate; and makes \$263,000 available for cooperation with States, instead of \$260,000 as proposed by the House, and \$275,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$1,187,500 for geologic surveys, of which \$150,000 is for surveys of areas containing deposits of petroleum and strategic minerals by geophysical methods, instead of \$1,000,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,337,500, as proposed by the Senate, of which \$466,000 may be used for salaries in the District of Columbia, instead of \$425,000, as proposed by the House, and \$506,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$157,500 for mineral resources of Alaska, as proposed by the House, instead of \$232,500, as proposed by the Senate, of which \$60,000 may be used for salaries in the District of Columbia, instead of \$85,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$1,795,800 for gaging streams, instead of \$1,635,800, as proposed by the House, and \$1,995,800, as proposed by the Senate; provides \$200,000 for salaries in the District of Columbia, instead of \$190,000, as proposed by the House, and \$215,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides \$1,300,000 for cooperative stream-gaging work, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,240,000, as proposed by the House; strikes out \$100,000 proposed by the Senate for stream-gaging work in Alaska, and provides \$100,000 for postwar surveys, instead of \$200,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$213,400 for classifi-

cation of lands, as proposed by the House, instead of \$248,400, as proposed by the Senate: strikes out the proposal of the Senate to make \$35,000 immediately available for development work in Alaska, and provides \$60,-000 for salaries in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House; appropriates \$101,-500 for printing and binding, instead of \$87,500, as proposed by the House, and \$115,-000 as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total for the Geological Survey.

BUREAU OF MINES

Nos. 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 215, 216, 218, 220, 221, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 230, 231, 234, 235, 239, 240, 246, 247, 249, 252, 254, relating to various items for the Bureau of Mines: Appropriates \$165,700 for salaries and expenses, instead of \$152,800, as proposed by the House, and \$180,400, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of \$12,900 being provided for the assistant director and his staff; authorizes the use of funds under the appropriation for operating mine-rescue cars for attendance at meetings, as proposed by the Senate, appropriates \$1,004,860 for coalmine inspections, which will provide for 25 additional inspectors, instead of \$939,910, as proposed by the House, and \$1,024,720, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the use of funds under the appropriation for attendance at meetings; appropriates \$100,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$454,800, as proposed by the Senate, for enforcement the Federal Explosives Act; appropriates \$320,000 for testing fuel, instead of \$300,000, as proposed by the House, and \$341,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$7,-000,000 for demonstration plants in connection with synthetic liquid fuels, instead of \$6,000,000, as proposed by the House, and \$10,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, provides \$50,000 for the temporary employment of engineers and architects, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the purchase of five automobiles for use in connection with the synthetic fuel program, instead of one, as proposed by the House, and 10, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$382,700 for mineral mining investigations, as proposed by the House, instead of \$447,700, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$579,000 for oil and gas investigations, as proposed by the House, instead of \$583,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$962,200 for mining experiment stations, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,027,200, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$515,000 for economics of mineral industries, as proposed by the House, instead of \$540,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which \$397,500 may be expended for salaries in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, instead of \$420,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$1,250,-000 for investigation of raw-material resources for steel production, instead of \$1,-000,000, as proposed by the House, and \$2,-795,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which \$40,000 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia; appropriates \$450,-000 for manganese beneficial pilot plants, instead of \$400,000, as proposed by the House, and \$475,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which \$16,000 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia; appropriates \$650,000 for production of alumina from lowgrade bauxite, aluminum clays, and alunite, instead of \$600,000, as proposed by the House, and \$675,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which \$29,200 may be used for salaries in the District of Columbia; appropriates \$2,-100,000 for investigation of deposits of critical and essential minerals, of which \$100,000 is for a special survey of the Coosa coal field in Alabama, instead of \$2,000,000, as proposed by the House, and \$2,610,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which \$55,000 may be used for salaries in the District of Columbia; strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$485,000 for continuing construction of the drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colo.; appropriates \$78,400 for helium utilization and research, as proposed by the House, instead

of \$80,000, as proposed by the Senate; and authorizes the use of funds under certain appropriations for hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Nos. 255, 256, 259, 261, 262, 263, 266, 267, 269, and 271, relating to various items for National Park Service: Appropriates \$468,890 for salaries and expenses, departmental, instead of \$429,900, as proposed by the House, and \$507,875, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$323,000 for regional offices, instead of \$298,000, as proposed by the House, and \$676,925, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$411,900 for national monuments, instead of \$402,286, as proposed the House, and \$676,95, as proposed by the the Senate; appropriates \$160,000 for national historical parks and memorials, instead of \$150,117, as proposed by the House, and \$170,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$249,038 for national military parks, battlefields, and cemeteries, instead of \$265,200, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$68,512 for the Boulder Dam National Recreational Area, Arizona and Nevada, instead of \$63,512, as proposed by the House, and \$70,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$213,100 for forest protection and fire prevention, as proposed by the House, in-stead of \$217,800, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$115,000 for recreational demonstration areas, instead of \$106,105, as pro-posed by the House, and \$125,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$400,000 for salaries and expenses, National Capital parks, as proposed by the House, instead of \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate; and authorizes the use of certain appropriations to the National Park Service for hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Nos. 272, 273, 274, 276, 277, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 292½, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, and 299, relating to various items for the Fish and Wildlife Service: Authorizes the use of funds for traveling expenses for the Service; appropriates \$206,190 for general administrative expenses, instead of \$198,780, as proposed by the House, and \$213,600, as proposed by the Senate, of which sum \$27,000 may be used for printing and binding; appropriates \$1,100,000 for propagation of food fishes, instead of \$1,046,200, as proposed by the House, and \$1,194,500, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$511,800 for investigations respecting food fishes, instead of \$489,300, as proposed by the House, and \$581,800, as proposed by the Senate, an increase of \$22,500 in the House bill being provided for a study of salmon spawning facilities on the Pacific coast; appropriates \$105,700 for the fishery market news service, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$36,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates \$624,700 for Alaska fisheries, instead of \$593,700, as proposed by the House, and \$666,000, as proposed by the Senate, the increase in the House bill providing \$15,000 additional for reserve stocks of foodstuffs for the population of the Pribilof Islands, and \$16,000 for replacement of property; appropriates \$18,000 for enforcement of Black Bass and Whaling Treaty Acts, instead of \$12,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates \$115,500 for fur-resources investigations, as proposed by the House, instead of \$143,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$181,550 for biological investigations, instead of \$169,550, as proposed by the House, and \$198,500, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of \$12,000 in the House bill being added to permit resumption of financial cooperation with wildlife research units in Alabama, Iowa, and Pennsylvania; appropriates \$875,000 for control of predatory animals, instead of \$753,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,000,000, as proposed by the

Senate; appropriates \$300,000 for protection of migratory birds, instead of \$294,600, as proposed by the House, and \$312,400, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$142,585 for enforcement of Alaska game law, instead of \$138,170, as proposed by the House, and \$242,000, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of \$4,415 in the House bill being provided for one additional airplane, including operation; appropriates \$625,200 for maintenance of mammal and bird reservations, instead of \$549,875, as proposed by the House, and \$687,400, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of \$75,325 in the House bill providing \$2,200 for replacement of trucks, \$66,325 for administration of seven newly created wildlife refuges, and \$6,800 for fire protection on refuges, and an unexpended balance of \$40,000 is continued available for lowering the level of the lake on Little Medicine Creek in the Wichita Mountain Wildlife Refuge, or, in the event such work is not necessary, for such other improvements as may be deened desirable; appropriates \$55,100 for migratory bird conservation refuges, which \$5,100 is for the Crescent Lake Refuge, Nebr., instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the House, and \$99,000, as proposed by the Senate; corrects the totals for salaries and expenses and the grand total for such Service; appropriates \$1,000,000 for Federal aid in wildlife restoration, instead of \$900,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the use of \$704,828 for personal services in the District of Columbia (departmental), instead of \$642,840, as proposed by the House, and \$768,782, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the purchase of 72 automobiles, instead of 22, as proposed by the House, and 122, as proposed by the Senate; and authorizes the use of funds for hire, maintenance, and op-eration of aircraft, as proposed by the Senate.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Nos. 301, 302, 303, and 304: Appropriates \$44,000 for expenses of the office of the Governor and the Secretary, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$39,175, as proposed by the House; appropriates \$1,038,900 for construction, repair, and maintenance of roads, instead of \$1,000,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,127,800, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of \$38,900 in the House bill being provided for construction, repair, and maintenance work only; and authorizes the use of certain funds for the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, as proposed by the Senate, amended to eliminate the items "Care and custody of insane," and "Wagon roads, bridges and trails."

GOVERNMENT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Nos. 305 and 307: Appropriates \$196,450 for salaries of the Governor and other employees, instead of \$179,965, as proposed by the House, and \$224,750, as proposed by the Senate, the increase in the House bill providing \$6,985 for a government secretary, \$7,000 for a legal counsel, and \$2,500 for the purchase of automobiles; and strikes out the provision of the Senate proposing an appropriation of \$51,000 to defray the deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of St. Croix.

MISCELLANEOUS

No. 308: Provides that automobiles may be purchased from the Federal surplus stock, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 309: Restores the provision of the House, stricken out by the Senate, which places limits on the amounts available for telephone tolls and telegrams and cable-grams.

No. 310: Corrects a section number.

Nos. 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, and 318, relating to the purchase of books: Authorizes the use for such purposes of the following amounts:

Office of the Secretary	\$2, 250
Division of Geography	300
Grazing Service	
General Land Office	1,000
Bureau of Reclamation	2,500
Geological Survey	6,000
Bureau of Mines	1, 250

No. 319: Corrects a section number.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

No. 5, relating to the Division of Geography: The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 11, relating to the Bonneville Power Administration: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 14, relating to the High Commissioner, Philippine Islands: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Nos. 16 and 17, relating to the Solid Fuels Administration for War: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Nos. 19, 21, and 22, relating to the Grazing Service: The House managers will move to recede and concur. It is the understanding of the conferees that funds to be made available under amendment 22 are for actual firefighting.

No. 50, relating to the revolving loan fund for Indians: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 57, relating to settlement of claims to water rights in the Gila River, Arizona: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 61, relating to the appropriation of Indian irrigation construction funds to be available until completion of projects: The House managers will move to recede and concur

No. 64, relating to an appropriation of \$25,000 for cooperation with the State of Oklahoma in the construction of an Indian arts and crafts building. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 65, relating to the appropriation for support of Indian schools: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Nos. 103, 107 and 114, providing that appropriations for education of natives in Alaska, medical relief in Alaska, and the reindeer service, Alaska, shall remain available until June 30, 1947: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 115, relating to expenses incident to fulfilling the Atoka agreement: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 121, providing for expenditures without regard to certain statutes: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 123, relating to the appropriation of funds for an attorney for the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma: It is the intention of the conferees that the Indians shall initiate the negotiation of the contract for employment of a tribal attorney who meets with their approval and that the contract shall be subsequently submitted to the Secretary for final approval. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 125, relating to payment of travel and other expenses to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 129, relating to the appropriation for Indian roads: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Nos. 134 and 135, relating to the payment of damages and rewards by the Reclamation Service: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 140, relating to payment to school districts, Grand Coulee Dam, Washington: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 145, relating to the period of availability of construction funds from the reclamation fund: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 147½, relating to the Gila project, Artzona: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Nos. 154, 155, and 156, relating to general investigations and totals from the reclamation fund. The House managers will move to recede and concur with amendments.

No. 153, relating to payment to the Boulder City School District: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Nos. 159 and 160, relating to the All-American Canal: The House managers will move to recede and concur in No. 159, and to recede and concur with an amendment in No. 160.

Nos. 164 and 165, relating to the period of availability of funds appropriated to the Colorado River Development Fund and funds for construction, Reclamation Service, general fund: The House managers will move to recede and concur in No. 164, and to recede and concur with an amendment in No. 165.

No. 176, relating to the period of availability of water conservation funds. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 177, relating to the Fort Peck project, Montana: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 178½; relating to the period of availability of funds for the Missouri River Basin: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 181, relating to the period of availability of funds for the Colorado River front work: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 214, inserting the words "wearing apparel and", in the appropriation for testing fuel. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Nos. 217, 219, 221½, and 222, relating to synthetic liquid fuels: The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

Nos. 228, 229, and 232, relating to investigation of raw-material resources for steel production: The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

Nos. 233 and 236, relating to manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research: The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

Nos. 237 and 238, relating to production of alumina from low-grade bauxite: The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

the Senate amendments.

Nos. 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, and 248, relating to legislative provisions in connection with appropriations for investigation of bauxite and alunite ores, magnesium pilot plants and research, and investigation of deposits of critical minerals: The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

Nos. 250 and 251, relating to helium utilization and research: The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

No. 253, excepting the appropriations for helium production from section 3709, Revised Statutes: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Nos. 257 and 258, relating to national parks: The House managers will move to recede and concur in No. 257 and to concur with an amendment in No. 258.

No. 260, authorizing the use of funds to maintain the former Cape Hatteras Light Station Reservation. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 264, relating to Lake Texoma Recreational Area, Texas and Oklahoma: The

House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 265, providing transportation and subsistence to persons attending fire-protection training camps, National Park Service: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 268, inserting the words "Chesapeake and Ohio Canal" in the appropriation paragraph "Salaries and expenses, National Capital parks": The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 270, inserting the words "and vicinity" in connection with educational lectures outside national parks, etc.: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 275, relating to the propagation of food fishes: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Nos. 278, 279, and 280, relating to the appropriation for commercial fisheries: The House managers will move to recede and concur in Nos. 278 and 279, and with an amendment in No. 280. The amount to be proposed will not include any funds for a survey in connection with the "Development of Alaska."

No. 287, relating to the purchase of bags, tags, and labels in connection with control of predatory animals: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 300, relating to acquisition of 10 surplus airplanes by the Fish and Wildlife Service: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 306, relating to the appointment of certain personnel by the Governor of the Virgin Islands: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 311, authorizing the use of funds for library membership: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 320, authorizing the Secretary to delegate power to authorize changes in official stations and payment of expenses: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 321, correcting a section number: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

JED JOHNSON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
ROBERT F. JONES,
BEN F. JENSEN,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the Part of the House,

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. May I ask the gentleman if the two items pertaining to the Central Valley relating to the planning for the steam plant and the transmission lines, which were left out of the bill, were left out without prejudice as to future consideration?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; that is the situation as it stands.

Mr. MILLER of California. There is no prejudice against those items with reference to future consideration?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is plainly stated in the report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Luther A. Johnson].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in this 1 minute I want to pay tribute to the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., who, on yesterday, resigned as Secretary of State and was immediately selected by President Truman to be the United States member of the Security

Council and chairman of the American delegation in the General Assembly of the United Nations when that organization is established.

No one has served his country with more ability and fidelity than Edward R. Stettinius. As Administrator of Lend-Lease, he made an outstanding record which met with the approval of the American people; as Under Secretary of State he made good, and as successor to Cordell Hull, he has made a very able Secretary of State, and in his new position, which is one of vast importance, and for which he is splendidly well equipped, I predict that he will render distinguished service to his country and the nations of the world in this great organization to preserve peace.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report to the House that your conferees on the Interior Department appropriation bill, after several days of conference with the Senate conferees, have actually reached a complete agreement. Although there are some 76 amendments which, under the rules of the House, must be reported in disagreement, actually there is no controversy over them, and at the appropriate time I shall submit a unanimous consent request in connection with most of these amendments in order to conserve the time of the House.

It is also a real pleasure and with considerable satisfaction to report that the House conferees were able to secure a very satisfactory agreement on the bill. There were 326 amendments inserted by the Senate. The House receded on 44 amendments, the Senate receded on 92 amendments, the House receded on 114 amendments, with amendments, and there are 76 amendments in technical disagreement. But of far more importance than the number of amendments that the House or Senate receded on is the total amount of funds on which the conferees finally agreed. The total of the bill as approved by the conferees is \$111,690,258. This is a reduction of \$32,-148,889 under the Budget estimates. The Senate conferees have yielded on a total reduction of \$28,702,174 in conference, and the House conferees have approved an increase of only \$10,447,630 in the bill as it passed the House.

These figures speak for themselves. It is by all odds the greatest saving ever made in an Interior Department appropriation bill. Possibly, there are some members of both Houses who are not entirely satisfied with every item in this bill. But, considering the fact that there were 326 amendments that were added by the Senate, and the further fact that the total appropriations were increased by that body from \$101,242,000 to more than \$140,000,000, the fact that your conferees were able to secure an agreement reducing that figure to \$111,690,258, or \$32,000,000 below the Budget estimates, is no small accomplishment, and I express the hope that the report of your conferees will meet with the approval of this House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as most of the Members of the House know, some of us from California have been deeply concerned about the Central Valley project. The report does not provide appropriations for making studies for the transmission line and the steam plant which we believe to be necessary in order to give that project integrity from an economic point of view, to guard the public investment, and to prevent all that power having to be sold to just one customer, namely, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. But what the report does do is to leave us in a position where the House has said that the failure to make these appropriations is without prejudice to the future consideration of appropriations for actual construction of those items.

Now, in the near future two huge generators are going to be transferred from Grand Coulee to Shasta Dam, which will step up greatly the production of electricity at Shasta. This conference report is our go-ahead sign to do the best we can when that time comes to secure the building of the transmission lines and steam plant that will be necessary to carry that additional power to the centers of consumption and to carry it there under such circumstances that the public investment can be protected and the people of our State can get the maximum benefit from it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to note that the conferees had removed from the bill the \$215,300 for a steam plant and transmission line in the Central Valley project of California. This appropriation was vitally important if the people of our State are to have low-cost power in the future. I note that the conference report in its explanation of this action states "the conferees are of the opinion that the existing arrangements should be retained without prejudice to those in favor of or those opposed to the construction of a steam plant or transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation."

Mr. Speaker, by this action in refusing this appropriation I hope nobody infers that Congress opposes public power development in California. I assume that the committee action this year is based on the shortage of critical materials, and not on the assumption that this Congress prefers private utility companies to public power. Consequently I assume that as soon as this shortage is over, it will be proper to come before the House again and request the funds necessary for the steam plant and transmission lines. That we cer-

tainly intend to do.

This issue has sometimes been confused as being limited to California, but that is not the case. True, Central Valley is a California project, but the basic issue is that of public versus private control of power, and that is Nation-wide. Those in this House from other States have in the long run as deep an interest in this problem as do we in California. I hope that next year when this matter is again before us that all of you who

believe that power should not be privately controlled, but should be administered in the public interest, will join us in this fight.

If you had a gold mine in your back yard and someone charged you extra for every ton of ore you took through your back gate, you would not sit back and let him get away with it, would you?

Now, the people of California have the equivalent of a new gold mine in low-cost power from Shasta Dam, key feature of the great Central Valley reclamation project. But as things now stand these people will have to pay a heavy toll for kilowatt-hour which travels through the transmission lines of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

The Bureau of Reclamation, operating on the policy of conserving and making wise use of western waters for the benefit of the greatest number, did not plan the Central Valley project or any feature of it to serve the stockholders of a particu-

lar private utility company.

The Bureau included in its 1946 budget plans at a cost of \$115,300 for building transmission lines from the dam to load centers in the Central Valley project area and \$100,000 for planning a steam power plant in the delta region. This power plant would increase the firm power available from Shasta Dam threefold. It is essential that these items be included for the successful development of Central Valley. Without plans for a distribution system, the Government will be forced to continue using the transmission facilities of the P. G. & E.

Unfortunately, the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, after hearing testimony of President James B. Black of the P. G. & E., slashed these two small but important items from the appropriations bill. Mr. Black's company offers very kindly to let the Government deliver 13/4 kilowatt-hours of energy for every 1 kilowatt-hour of current it transmits to the point of usage for the Government.

This is a very nice plan for the P. G. & E., but not for the people whose prosperity depends on getting lower rates for electricity. Fortunately, the Senate recognized that the P. G. & E., not the people, would benefit from the omission of the two items from the Budget and promptly restored them. However, these items were again stricken out in conference.

If the transmission lines and Delta steam-power plant are not eventually included in plans for distributing Shasta power, Central Valley will be shackled with the chains of a monopolistic private utility.

The Central Valley project was built for the people. Shasta Dam can give them, among other multiple-purpose benefits, low-cost power to light their homes, to make their work easier, to attract new industries offering job opportunities to returning servicemen and others.

In areas like the State of Washington and the Tennessee Valley, where the Government markets the power from its great plants, the people share in the profits.

If the industrial and agricultural regions of California can get Shasta power without paying at the toll gate of P. G. & E., the energy will be delivered to them

at charges that compare well with the low rates for electric energy in the rest of the United States.

It is up to the Congress to decide whether to favor the few or to help the many. I hope that next year we restore this cut. Those of us in California who realize how vitally important this power issue is intended to continue our efforts here in behalf of the great mass of our people.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gen-

tleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman from California should be commended for his statement. At the same time it would be appropriate to point out at this point in your remarks that the two items to which you have referred were authorized by the Congress in the original Central Valley authorizing legislation. In asking for appropriations to cover their construction cost we are merely asking for the financing of that which was within the contemplation of the membership at the time the Central Valley project was first presented to the Congress. I am delighted to receive the assurances of the managers of the conference that they will not oppose appropriations for the steam stand-by plant, the transmission lines, and the Kings River project at the proper time.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman. He is quite correct in his statement.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. These items should be put in this bill at this time. The longer you delay it the harder it is going to be for the people of northern and central California to benefit from the Shasta Dam power.

Mr. OUTLAND. I agree with the gentleman. But I was trying simply to point out that as long as they were not included I wanted it very clearly understood it is not an action which is prejudicial to the future consideration of it. The sooner appropriations are made, the better so far as the interests of the people as a whole are concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Cali-

fornia [Mrs. DougLas].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California, Mr. Speaker, we are not asking that the report be recommitted or that the action of the conferees be rejected because of the shortness of time and because the report makes it possible to bring the matter up again before the Deficiency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee or the Interior Subcommittee for reconsideration without preju-

I reiterate that to complete and make useful the Central Valley project there must be built a transmission system and stand-by steam plant as soon as possible. California must have these facilities as a necessary part of her development. Cheap water and cheap power will provide for California a basis for achieving the essential balance of industry and agriculture necessary to a

healthy postwar economy. We cannot have jobs for all just by wishing for them. We must take the necessary measures to create new basic wealth.

One hundred and thirty-five million dollars has been invested in the Central Valley project by the Government. This money must not become merely a contribution by the taxpayers of the United States to the capital of any one company. It must be an income-producing investment of the United States, from which the Treasury of the United States will derive the greatest possible return, and which will bring the greatest possible benefit to all of the people of California and finally to the people of the whole Nation.

In order to do that, the project must be finished as soon as possible. Finishing the project means building transmission lines and a steam plant in order to bring the power that will be generated at Shasta and Keswick at the cheapest possible cost to the places where it can be used. What we have done so far is to build a house without building the roads leading to it.

When the two generators belonging to Shasta Dam, which have been put into Grand Coulee for the war emergency are returned to Shasta Dam, and when the Keswick Dam is completed and the authorized generators installed we will have a power installation of 350,000 kilowatts at the two plants or more than double the capacity now installed.

The transmission facilities, public and private, that are now available cannot carry this additional power. Before the Shasta units are brought back to California, where they belong, and before Keswick is completed, more transmission lines must be built. And a steam plant must be built.

These facilities should be built by the Federal Government if power is to play its vital role in providing work for the more than 8,000,000 people in California. There can be no question about the necessity for the facilities. The only issue is whether the facilities should be built by a single private monopoly to be used for its own purposes and for the purpose of deriving an unearned margin from a huge Federal investment, or whether they should be built by the Federal Government, acting as a prudent businessman, to realize a maximum return for the taxpayers and maximum benefits for the people.

Not only will the Government transmission system in the Central Valley assure to the Government a sound businesslike power operation that will return its investment with interest but it will also make it possible for municipalities and other public agencies that have been paying to the P. G. & E. from 7.7 mills to 11.2 mills for power to get it for onethird less-between 4.8 and 6.8 mills. In Redding today the Central Valley power would bring that city's cost of wholesale power down from 71/2 mills to about 5 mills. Other municipalities that already own their own distribution systems are eager to get this public power at wholesale at these lower rates. By law and equity, they have a right to get it.

The Government will also make substantial savings if the power system is

built. It will get more for its power than it gets from the P. G. & E. It will also be able to use large quantities in its own pumping operations necessary to bringing water to the land in California. The Delta Mendota Canal and the Delta Cross Channel will be operated by pumps that will require more than 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy annually to bring Sacramento River floodwaters to the thirsty lands of the San Joaquin Valley. Why should the Government sell its own power 150 miles up at Shasta to a private utility company and at the same time buy 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours to operate its pumps in the Delta region from the same company? To do this makes The cost of pumping this no sense. water will bear directly upon the water users. The water users-farmers-have a right to be assured that the operating costs of these great pumps that will supply them with life-giving water will not be padded by unnecessary profits to a private utility.

We feel confident that when this issue is squarely presented to the Members of Congress, as is permitted by the conferees' report, the Members will vote for the additional investment which will really determine the usefulness of the expenditure that has already been made and will determine to a large measure the future economic development of California.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the conferees on the Interior Department Appropriation bill for 1946, H. R. 3024, did not see fit to accept the amendment of the Senate to item 167 of the conference report, and include in it the appropriation to carry out the Central Valley project of California. The recommendations were for advance planning of a steam plant and transmission line as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation and approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

There seems to be a great deal of confusion as to the necessity for these two integral parts of the Central Valley project. This confusion stems from sources without the Federal Government.

The Central Valley project has been studied for many years by both State and Federal agencies and they have prepared a well-integrated plan in which reclamation, flood control, irrigation, salinity control, and power development and sale, each plays its part.

The Central Valley project is of vital economic interest to all of California, north of Techachapi Mountains. It contemplates the irrigation of land in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys, the control of floods, the constant release of water to aid navigation and to hold back the encroachment of salt water and on top of these, the development of cheap hydroelectric energy as a source of revenue to help pay for the costs of the structures incident to the project and to furnish a cheap source of heat and power so vital in the economy of the West.

The necessity for a steam power plant to firm the hydroelectric energy and make it salable is self-evident and the necessity for a publicly owned transmission line from Shasta Dam to a point in the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area is also self-evident. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co, now exercises a monopoly in the metropolitan bay area and until this monopoly is broken, the industrial development so essential to support the new populations in that area will not take place.

Shortly after the cessation of the war in the Pacific, we will be looking for jobs for our returning veterans and those out of employment, due to the shut-down of war work, and if we are to employ these people at standard wages on important work, we must have the plans prepared for this work. Let me call your attention to the fact that in northern California where much war work has been done, where a great many men have gone to the armed services, no provision is presently made for a public-works program of this magnitude to take up the slack in employment; and we in that section of the State had looked to the Central Valley project for this purpose.

The failure of the Congress to appropriate \$215,300 for advance plans will retard full employment in this area.

The Central Valley projects effects all of northern California, and is not limited to any one political subdivision or any one specific area, an argument that seems to have gained credence in the House

In closing, I am happy to say that the conferees removed the impediments placed on this project in the original report of the House committee, and in lieu thereof, wrote into the report on this item the following words:

In view of this situation, the conferees are of the opinion that the existing arrangements should be retained without prejudice to those in favor or opposed to a steam plant or a transmission line by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The people of California and the people affected by this great over-all project have spoken at the polls and they know what they want and they want the steam plant and the cheap electricity that can only be delivered on a publicly owned transmission line.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that the committee which has this bill in charge has failed to recommend to the House an appropriation sufficient to continue the Central Valley program.

The Central Valley project was inaugurated in 1933 through a referendum election. The State of California was unable to finance this great development, the cost of which has been estimated at one-third of a billion dollars. I was one of a group of Representatives who took the initiative in advancing this project. We took the matter up with the late President Roosevelt, who gave it his wholehearted support.

The Central Valley project embraces a vast empire equal to the combined area of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island and one-half of New Jersey, and is traversed by two great navigable rivers flowing into the bay of San Francisco. One of the primary objects of the project is to save over 1,000,000 acres of the most fertile land in the world from salt-water erosion. Before the Federal Government

undertook this project over 50,000 acres of land had already been destroyed.

The importance of this great fertile valley is attested by the fact that it has been the breadbasket of the Pacific war effort. Immediately adjacent to the port of San Francisco which is today the greatest port of embarkation in the world, it has furnished huge quantities of fresh foods for our fighting forces in the Pacific and our tremendously increased civilian population engaged on war production.

It is essential that Congress continue the appropriation for this well-planned program which was carefully studied over a long period of years. It is false economy to hastily discontinue a work so well started and which has proven its importance to the entire United States.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Speaker, Shasta Dam, the principal unit of the Central Valley project, is in my district, through which the great Sacramento flows. The Shasta power plant and the Keswick Dam and power plant are only partly installed at the present time. Two 75,000-kilowatt units have been installed at Shasta Dam; none at Keswick Dam. Two more 75,000-kilowatt generators have been constructed for Shasta Dam but are temporarily installed at Grand Coulee Dam in the State of Washington. These generators are expected to be returned to Shasta Dam to aid northern and central California in meeting the growing power demands of our region. I hope these units may be released at Grand Coulee Dam in the very near future and that they then can be brought back to Shasta Dam.

They were placed in Grand Coulee Dam before Shasta Dam was completed when the war emergency was such that these units were needed critically in the Northwest, where open places for generators still were available at Grand Coulee Dam.

I give you this information as background. I am disappointed that the conference committee on the Interior Department bill did not see fit to include the \$215,300 estimate for studies for transmission lines and a stand-by plant on the Central Valley project. I am most gratified, however, that the House managers have taken the position in presenting the conference report to the House that the omission of these relatively small items for studies is without prejudice to later action on requests of the Bureau of Reclamation for funds to These construct transmission lines. lines will be needed to carry the power from Shasta Dam to load centers and to the project pumps in the San Joaquin Valley and along the Contra Costa Canal, and they should be built when they are

The situation is that the Bureau of Reclamation has been denied funds by the Congress to make the studies for the transmission lines and a steam plant this coming fiscal year of 1946. This will not affect the authority of the Bureau of Reclamation to build the lines and necessary stand-by plants, which are a part of the Central Valley project. These facilities can be built when needed, provided the Congress appropriates money for them at that time. I am assured by the Bureau of Reclamation that, since

the action we are taking today is without prejudice, the Bureau will submit estimates for the Congress to consider when these facilities are required. The Appropriations Committee, through its spokesmen, the House managers on this Interior Department appropriation bill for 1946, has assured the Congress that it will give due and unprejudiced consideration to those estimates of the Bureau of Reclamation when they are submitted at a later time.

I want to thank the members of the Interior Subcommittee for the conscientious consideration they have given, individually and collectively, of the needs of the Central Valley project and of this matter of the transmission lines and the stand-by plant.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when this appropriation bill was up before the House I commented on the failure of the committee to allow a small appropriation of \$215,000 for purposes of studying the requirements and preparing necessary plans for transmission lines and a steam plant.

At that time I expressed the hope that the elimination of this item would not indicate that the Appropriation Committee was determined not to provide for the building of these transmission lines

and the steam plant.

No one knows exactly what will be needed in this line. But we do know that we have \$150,000,000 in the CVP and perhaps \$200,000,000 more will be required to complete it. The biggest source of revenue from this vast expenditure will be the sale of power. With such a large output we need our own transmission lines; we may need a steam plant. At any rate, I want the Reclamation Bureau to have enough money to determine what we need and when they have determined what is needed I want to help support a plan to get it built. In my district is the first big public customer for this public power. the Sacramento Municipal Utility District. It serves 60,000 customers. want to be in a position to give them their electricity over our own lines. This is only the beginning, as other public bodies and units will want this power, and in the end it will be the feature of the CVP which will make the whole project solvent and a money maker. Therefore, I am glad that the conference report indicates that we still will have a chance to get the necessary money for a study of the need for transmission lines and for the lines and the steam plant if they are necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Curis].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that as there are only about 2 days left of this fiscal year and that the decisions made by the conferees will prevail.

There is, however, a matter which I must call to your attention because it is going to result in a very serious situation. I refer to the item in this appropriation which, if it were appropriated, would not be spent in my district or even in my State, but it does vitally affect some producers in the district that I have the honor to represent.

In the western end of Nebraska, particularly in the western end of Chase County, we have a rural-electrification district that has been securing its power from the city of Holyoke, Colo. Those farmers have installed water pumps and irrigation systems. They have purchased cream separators, sewing machines, and countless other things because they have been using electricity. The city of Holyoke has notified them that they cannot take on any additional customers and that their present contract, when it expires, cannot be renewed.

Farther to the west in Colorado the taxpayers have spent a great deal of money to build the Big Thompson project. It is being completed. It took your money to build it. They have power for sale. The sale of that power will materially help to pay for the cost of the project. The Bureau of Reclamation has plans to extend lines from Brush, Colo., to Sterling, and then to Holyoke where it would supply these rural-electrification districts, particularly the one to

which I referred.

The Bureau of the Budget approved this item. I appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations in behalf of this project. It was not put in the bill. I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee. They did put it in the bill. It passed the Senate. The conferees have taken it out.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that is not one of those things where somebody is trying to get a new project started. We have a rural-electrification district that has been in operation. Individuals have spent their money, and their power is going to be shut off. It definitely relates to the food situation. I have in mind one farm unit in the territory that is served by this district where the farmer last year produced in excess of 25,000 pounds of beef, in excess of 25,000 pounds of pork, and 10,000 bushels of wheat, as well as other food products. Other farmers produce great amounts of food also.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. CURTIS. I find some language in the statement of the managers on the part of the House to the effect that this item was rejected, and the conferees recommend that the REA build this line. If the chairman of the committee would inform me a little bit about the intention of the conferees I would appreciate it very much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman that the conferees of both the House and the Senate considered and discussed the situation at great length. The committee understands and appreciates the very serious shortage of power in that great rich farm area and the further fact that there is apparently no private company in a position to supply the power. But the committee felt it was an REA project so far as the rural area is concerned. For that reason the committee rejected the item. The gentleman recalls that on yesterday I offered an amendment to the deficiency bill to restore the amount

of \$70,000,000 that had been stricken from the appropriation for rural electrification loans. If the Rural Electrification Administration can possibly take care of this project so far as the rural areas are concerned, then the committee feels it should be given the opportunity to do so.

Mr. CURTIS. And I supported the gentleman's amendment for an increase of \$70,000,000 for REA. I think it is a serious question whether the REA has lawful authority to build a line of this kind. They perhaps have, and I hope they have.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield. Mr. RANKIN. I have investigated this proposition, and I find that the Rural Electrification Administration—that is, the cooperative power association that borrows its money through the REAhas the right to build this line to serve these cooperatives only. However, it would not have the right to build a highpower line to serve a municipality in which it did not own the distribution system.

So, if the municipality is to be served you will have to get the line built by the Bureau of Reclamation. If there is no one to be served except the people in the cooperative power associations, whether they are farmers or not, then the REA has a right to loan the money to the cooperative power association to build this high-power line.

Mr. CURTIS. The extension of this power line will definitely hasten the day when the Big Thompson project will be paid for and the taxpayers will have their money. We want to help pay for it. I hope that this serious mistake can be rectified at an early date.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again ex-

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to compliment the Senate and House conferees on their wisdom in restoring the appropriation to continue the employee-award system in the Interior Department. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], and myself had evidenced interest in this question when the bill was debated in the House. I think the conferees were wise in restoring that item and I am confident that in future years the Congress will want to continue the appropriation, and probably increase it. Both in private industry and government, awards systems have shown their value in promoting individual initiative and improving employee morale. Those in the Interior Department responsible for inaugurating this system should also be com-

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished and active and able member of this committee the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I probably will not use all my time, but I do wish to explain as best I can the reason why the committee took the action they did on the transmission line in eastern Colorado and western Nebraska to furnish power to the farmers of that area. The REA is in reality the farmers' own organization; they feel that it is their business; and since this project would accommodate farmers generally we felt they should get the appropriation from the REA, especially since an appropriation of \$200,-000,000 for REA was in the making and was quite sure of being passed by Congress. In fact, since that time it has passed the House.

Relative to the Central Valley, about which a few of our colleagues from California are so greatly concerned, as I said when this bill was before the House before, the Congress has been very liberal with California and the other Western States. Here is the story in a nutshell.

The Interior Department operates mostly west of the ninety-seventh meridian and the taxpayers of the Nation have spent a lot of money to develop the Western States. They have spent a lot of money to provide electric power to California and to some of the other Western States as well as to provide needed water. The taxpayers of this Nation have been willing to do that as long as the war is in progress. The electric rates on the west coast are about half again as cheap because of Federal power as they are in other sections of the country. So the committee is trying to get your house in order so that when the war is over other Members of Congress will continue to help develop the Western States.

Now if the eastern and middle western part of the United States is to pay a share of the electric power bill of the people of the west coast and of the Western and Southwestern States after this war is over they simply will say, "No; you don't get a dime, because your revenues from the federally supported power projects are not paying out as was agreed under the basic acts."

I hope you can understand that this committee is not fighting the battle for the private power companies. To the contrary, we have absolutely done the things we thought were best not only for California and the Western States, but for the United States as a whole. May I remind you that I am personally interested in the development of the Missouri River Basin but I want it to be a sound undertaking.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to my good

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to my good friend from Iowa that the cheapest rates on the Pacific coast are at Tacoma and Seattle, Wash., neither one of which receives a dime from the Federal Government for their power systems; and both of them generate their electricity with water power.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. gentleman made the statement that the taxpayers of this Nation are building these transmission lines and generating plants on the west coast and that the taxpayers on the east coast are paying for at least part of the cost of these installations. Does the gentleman really mean that?

Mr. JENSEN. At the present time, under the present rate charges, the people of the East have been paying part of it in my studied opinion, and so have the people of my State.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Members of the House have always been informed that these Federal power projects were self-liquidating. What are the facts about the matter? We want to know whether we are being fooled or not; we want to know whether these projects are self-liquidating.

Mr. JENSEN. What we are trying to do is get the Federal powerhouse in order in the Western States, so that it will pay operation, maintenance, and amortize the Government loan in the course of the years, which the law provides; and if we do that then the folks of other States will have no complaint and you will have no argument against the continuation and the completion of these Federal power and reclamation projects. Certainly that is our responsibility as members of this subcommittee, and we accept it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think it is most important that we clear this question up as to whether or not these transmission projects throughout the West, about which the gentleman speaks, are self-liquidating or not. The gentleman implies that the people on the eastern seaboard are paying for them and at the same time we ourselves are paying twice as high a power rate. I would like to have that thing cleared up for the record.

Mr. JENSEN. Under the present setup, I can tell the gentleman that his people are paying for part of it, according to the best information available to us.

Mr. BATES of Massachussetts. Does the gentleman from Mississippi agree in that?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I do not.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. HAVENNER. Is it not true that there is no hope of amortizing the Federal investment in the Central Valley project within any reasonable period of time unless we have a maximum revenue from power.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right; and we are not going to get the maximum revenue from the power part of the project, because the rates are not high enough as presently set up.

The gentleman from California was chairman of the committee that set the rates in California. The gentleman assisted in preparing and setting up the power rates in California under which all the private industries had to charge. Certainly the gentleman does not want to come here now and say that the power rates are wrong out there for private power after he helped to set them up.

Mr. HAVENNER. The gentleman does not say that, but the gentleman believes in the philosophy of abundance rather than in the philosophy of scarcity. The gentleman wants to make this power available to all the people of the State, and that will increase the revenues of the project.

Mr. JENSEN. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman, for whom I have the highest regard, but certainly, the gentleman cannot defend a position on this thing against the fact that the power rates out there of \$17.50 per kilowatt-year, or less than 2 mills per kilowatt, which does not and cannot pay its share of operation, maintenance, and amortization. It may have been able to do it during the war, because of the great demand for power by the war plants, although that has not even been proven, due to the fact we cannot get the facts and figures out of the Interior Department to prove it to our satisfaction. After the war, when the power consumption goes down, then you are going to come in here crying and asking us to appropriate more money to make up the difference, then the real trouble will start.

Mr. HAVENNER. I disagree with you on that. We will be able to sell all the power we can generate.

Mr. JENSEN. I hope you will be able to do so, at a price that will pay the

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.
Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr.

Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to say to the gentleman that of course our western projects include flood control and a number of other aspects, and you cannot necessarily be expected to liquidate all the charges and costs out of the power revenues alone; but Boulder Dam certainly proves that a western power project will pay the entire cost and that a project can do that with the revenues allocated to power expenditures. It has done so and at a higher rate of interest than has been charged on other projects.

Mr. JENSEN. Would the gentleman be in favor of changing all of the laws which govern all the Federal power and reclamation projects to comply and to coincide with the basic law of Boulder Dam and the rates they charge? Would the gentleman be satisfied with that? Let me say that is exactly what Congress should do, and do it now.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the Boulder Dam rates have been discriminatorily high in many instances.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman just indicated they were satisfactory.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I said they paid the entire cost, and they paid it at a higher rate than charged on other projects.

Mr. JENSEN. And nobody getting power from Boulder is crabbing about

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is true, and every one of these projects should be set up on a basis where they will pay back to the Government every cent that can be properly allocated to power expense. I think every one of them are going to do just that.

Mr. JENSEN. They will have to change their ways and their rates, or they will not do it. I am glad to know the gentleman favors the Boulder Dam set-up, because it has as near a perfect set-up as can be, paying its own way, meeting every obligation, because their rates are right and fair.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know of any project that is not paying its own way.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman understands that all rivers are different. That is all the more reason for having a complete study of each river as an entity.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. We need a complete study in order to get all the facts in black on white.

Mr. HORAN. And allocating those costs according to the benefits that the Nation derives from them?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. Mr. HORAN. On the basis of the Shipshaw contract with Canada, does the gentleman know the Nation has saved over \$200,000,000 alone because of Bonneville in the production of aluminum?

Mr. JENSEN. I know that it has done a good job, but I want the rates properly adjusted, so it can stand on its own feet.

Mr. HORAN. Those are direct savings to the taxpayers of the Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.
Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I want

to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not what the gentleman from Iowa said is true that these power dams on the western seaboard are being paid for out of the money of the taxpayers of the Nation and are not self-liquidat-ing? May I ask the chairman of the committee if he intends to inform the committee on that?

Mr. GEARHART. The should not be concerned about the taxpayers of the Nation. California is one of the States that pays into the Federal Treasury more in taxes than is ever appropriated back to it. When money is appropriated for expenditures in California the Congress merely appropriates money collected from the taxpayers of the State of California. The taxpayers of the Nation are riding on our coattails. not California on theirs.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That applies to the people of the eastern seaboard also.

Mr. GEARHART. It is true in respect to seven or eight, or, possibly, to nine States of the Union. Reclamation in California is no burden upon the taxpayers of the Nation. Let the gentleman from Massachusetts be at ease.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. like to have the chairman of the committee say whether or not he is going to inform the House as to the fact, whether or not these are self-liquidating projects?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Generally speaking, I will say that all of these projects will be paid back to the Government over a period of 40 years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact that California gets credit for the Home State Mine, the property of which is located in my State, but its office is now in San Francisco?

Mr. GEARHART. California is one of the seven or eight States which pays into the national coffers more than it receives back. Though but one of the 48 States of the Union, California pays into the Treasury more than one-twentieth of the total tax collections. If proper credit were given for its proportionate share of the excise taxes actually collected within its boundaries, the record would show, I am quite sure, that California pays as much as one-fifteenth of all the taxes from whatever source received.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it does get credit for the Home State Mine. as I said.

Mr. GEARHART. That is as nothing when compared to the tobacco excise taxes actually collected in California but credited to other States, North Carolina, for instance.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the point in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Cali-

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at a point following the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include some tables that I have prepared.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to answer the argument that has been advanced here to the effect that these power projects are not self-liquidating but are paid for by the taxpayers of the East.

The two finest power projects in the West are located at Tacoma and Seattle, Wash. They have lower power rates than they have even in Los Angeles, Calif. They are water-power projects and are paying for themselves. The Seattle system is competing with a private concern.

Remember this: You are not going to increase revenue by increasing the cost of power to the ultimate consumer. We found that the lower the rates are the more power people use and the greater revenue is derived therefrom. Exorbitant rates cut down consumption and reduce the revenues.

You can produce power in Pennsylvania, or anywhere else where there is an abundance of coal, and distribute it at the TVA rates without loss to legitimate investors. You can distribute at the rates Boulder Dam power is distributed, or at the Tacoma or Seattle rates without loss to legitimate investors.

You can produce power for 1 mill a kilowatt-hour for every dollar a ton you pay for your coal. You can produce power in Pennsylvania with Pennsylvania coal and distribute it profitably at the TVA rates, the Tacoma rates, the Seattle rates, or at the rates the consumers in Los Angeles have to pay for Boulder Dam power. But you are not doing it. You are permitting them to charge you unreasonably high rates all over the Northeastern States.

You can transmit power—and you will find this statement by the very finest engineers in the hearings on the St. Lawrence project—at a cost of a little less than one-half mill per kilowatt-hour for every 100 miles; therefore you can generate this power at the mouth of the mine and transmit it and deliver it anywhere within 300 miles at the rates Boulder Dam power is laid down in the city of Los Angeles, 268 miles from Boulder Dam, or TVA power is laid down wholesale throughout the TVA area.

Power is being generated in Louisiana by the use of natural gas, transmitted up into Arkansas several hundred miles, and sold wholesale at 2.6 mills a kilowatthour, or about half what we are paying for wholesale power from Muscle Shoals, 100 miles from the dam; and at a little more than half what we are paying for power from Muscle Shoals at Florence, Sheffield, and Tuscumbia, in sight of Muscle Shoals.

These power projects in the West will liquidate themselves if you permit the people to get this power at rates they can afford to pay, because they will use so much more of it and it will bring so much more revenue that those dams will never cost the people of Massachusetts or Pennsylvania or New York one dollar.

The same thing applies to the St. Lawrence project. I went over it in the hearings with the engineers on both sides. I went entirely through the hearings and cross-examined those engineers. You can develop power on the St. Lawrence and transmit it to cover that entire area, including Massachusetts, and distribute it at the same rates that the people of the West are receiving Boulder Dam power or power from the Columbia River, at the same rates we are receiving power throughout the Tennessee Valley area, and pay every dollar that is invested in less than 50 years.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The question of the determination of power rates in most of the States of the Union is in the hands of what we call public-service commissions, and the only question I am interested in is whether or not the gentleman from Iowa is correct when he said the taxpayers of this country are paying for these power set-ups throughout the country.

Mr. RANKIN. No; he is not correct.
Mr. JENSEN. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. RANKIN. No; he is not correct. Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. If he is correct, we want to know about it.

Mr. RANKIN. I will take every one of those projects and go through them from top to bottom and I can show that they are self-liquidating. It may take 40 or 50 years, but in that time they will pay back every dollar that is invested, and it will not cost the taxpayers of this country one penny. The whole Tennessee Valley Authority will pay every dollar invested for flood control and navigation and power, within less than 50 years at the present rates, and never cost the taxpayers of this country a dollar.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish the gentleman would get from the Department of the Interior, from the Bureau of Reclamation, or from the Federal Power Commission the facts and figures showing that his statement is right.

Mr. RANKIN. I have already had those figures. I have gone over them with the engineers in every department of government that knows anything about power, and I can say to the gentleman from Iowa he was never worse wrong in his life. I have heard that argument before.

Mr. JENSEN. They will not even submit it to us.

Mr. RANKIN. But I have gone into it with engineers who know. Remember, that the reclamation feature is paying its own way.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I ask the gentleman if it is not true that the Bonneville power at

the present rate of \$17.50 a kilowatt year is paying out?

Mr. RANKIN. Why, certainly.

Mr. ANGELL. And it will continue to

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; it will. As I said, within anywhere from 30 to 50 years it will pay every dollar we have invested out there and it will not cost the taxpayers a nickel.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Of course the gentleman knows that at the Bonneville Dam only one-third is charged to power. Of course, if that is the case rates can be low. But the taxpayers of Massachusetts are not going to pay the bill. We do not want to pay the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. I will make this statement in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts: I will guarantee that within 50 years, at the present rate. Bonneville will pay every dollar which has been invested in the Bonneville Dam in power rates alone. And it will not cost the American people a dime. Why do we stand here and quibble about the development of our water power, the greatest natural resource in all the world outside of the soil from which we live? Why do we not go ahead and develop it now and let this generation get the benefit of Why quibble over these power lines and stand-by plants for which the people are pleading, and which would be one of the greatest services that Congress could render them at this time?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rockwell].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the House conferees on this Interior appropriation bill to delete the appropriation to continue the drainage tunnel at Leadville, Colo., is very disappointing. When this bill was considered by the House Committee on Appropriations, we did not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget for the \$485,000 requested, and therefore, we could not properly present our case to the committee.

This drainage tunnel was requested by the War Production Board about 2 years ago to drain the water from the great lead and zinc mines around Leadville. There was fear of a serious shortage of these ores for the war effort and it was felt that if this known body of ore at Leadville were not tapped, the result might be disastrous to our continued production of war material. It was intended that the total cost for the drainage tunnel would not exceed one and onehalf million dollars and with reasonable progress, it would be completed by July 1, 1945. A bill to provide these funds was approved by the House committee and passed Congress at that time. Unforeseen difficulties and the manpower shortage have delayed the completion of the tunnel in the estimated time and the costs have advanced proportionately.

The tunnel has now been constructed about 1½ miles. The Bureau of Mines believes that there are 3,000,000 pounds of lead and zinc that this tunnel can tap. By appropriating \$485,000, the amount of the rejected amendment—or about one-third the amount already spent—the tunnel can be driven to the Hayden shaft where these great bodies of ore can be recovered.

Should work stop at this time, it will be a dead-end tunnel, because it is still a half mile from the sources of lead and zinc and copper ore. However, if it is completed to the Hayden shaft, the lead. zinc, and copper that may be so important before the war is over will be released for any present or future need. It will open up metal mines long since closed, and thereby provide employment in the postwar period. Through the voluntary offer of 80 owners of these mines to pay on a royalty basis for the ore so opened up, the Bureau of Mines anticipates the repayment of much of this total cost to the Government. Therefore. while we are disappointed at the decision of the House conferees in refusing to accept the Senate amendment to continue this tunnel, the reasons for its continuance are so all-important and desirable that we shall at a later date request that the appropriation for its continuation be cared for in a deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota, a member of the committee, 1 minute.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to compliment this subcommittee on handling the bill in conference, so quickly and completely, coming to an agreement on some 326 amendments and bringing in a report of this sort which can be acted upon today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the distinguish gentleman from South Dakota is very generous in his praise of the work of our committee. Let me assure him that his kind remarks are deeply appreciated.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is a remarkable achievement. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, chairman of the committee, a question with respect to the effect of the conference agreement on amendments Nos. 178 and 179 which relate to the Missouri River Basin.

As I understand it, the House figure was \$1,440,000 which the House committee very kindly put in, on short notice, to get the proposition started. The Senate proposed \$4,680,000. But the compromise conference agreement is \$3,200,-000. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Two hundred thousand dollars of that is available for transfer to the work on the manganese project by the Bureau of Mines at Chamberlain?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is also correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say that was done largely because of the interest of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Case].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona, chairman of the great Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House [Mr. Murrock].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, while want to congratulate the conferees of the House on holding this report more nearly to the will as expressed by the House, I am not entirely satisfied with the total appropriations for the Reclamation Service. Some of the items are satisfactory and some far from being so, in my judgment. The item for general surveys and investigation, while listed as subject to amendment, is likely to be less than what I think the Bureau of Reclamation should have for that all-important work at this critical time. However, I shall have more to say about that when we reach it, among the amendments in disagreement.

Of course, it will be pointed out that the appropriation this year in some respects is more than was appropriated for the same purposes heretofore. To my mind that is not an adequate view to take. During the 43 years in which the Bureau of Reclamation has been doing the splendid work in reclaiming Western lands from the desert, it has spent nearly \$1,000,000,000 and reclaimed about 4,000,-000 acres of land. However, in less than half that time in the future I expect to see more than twice that number of acres irrigated, perhaps by an expenditure of four or five billion dollars. This may seem staggering to some but to me anything short of this result in the next 20 years will be a dismal failure on our part and will mean our selling America short. I wish the appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation today might reflect more adequately the beginnings on the great possibilities to which I have just referred.

During the past 9 years, when I have annually appeared before the subcommittee on this bill, they have seen the word "Gila" written all over my face, for I have invariably put in a plea for the Gila project. This year, as chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I broadened my interest and took in reclamation in all of the 17 Western States. I am not unmindful of the fact that the conferees have raised the amount for the Gila project somewhat over the House figure, but again I do not believe that the increase was enough when we consider the immediate possibilities of that project in Yuma County. Ariz. Why is it not enough?

I have already received more than a hundred letters from persons in uniform, men and women, soldiers and sallors, who would like to own a piece of land in that project. I am glad to say that the bill which the House passed on April 17, that is, H. R. 2742, will go a long way toward making homes available for

veterans if sufficient money is appropriated to put water on the land. I judge that the amount written into the bill will make it possible, within the next 12 months, to make available a considerable block of this land on the outskirts of Yuma, Ariz. Having worked hard to get this appropriation, I shall needle the Bureau of Reclamation to see that all the land that may be watered is quickly made available for our returning vetcrans. I wish the conferees had been even this generous in appropriating for other projects where land could be made available quickly for the Nation's defenders.

Lately I have heard some discussion about the relative parts of irrigation and hydroelectric power production in the reclamation program. Some of my colleagues are inclined to be critical. One said to me the other day, "The Bureau of Reclamation would be better off if it confined its work to putting water on the land and did not go in for power production." Now that sentiment seems to me to reveal a lack of understanding of our problem in the West. Power production must go hand in hand with irrigation or we cannot have either. The easiest irrigation projects have already been developed, where handling the water was the chief question and power production was relatively less significant, but that is no longer true. The big jobs which are expensive and which tax the ingenuity of the hydraulic engineer to the uttermost are the jobs which remain to be done by the Bureau of Reclamation. In such jobs power production must play an important part.

This is what is meant by multiple purpose dams. A given project may involve besides irrigation, power production, flood control, possibly navigation, and other features by no means insignificant, such as conservation, wildlife protection, and the like. Manifestly, it would be unfair to charge the cost of the construction to any one of these benefits alone. It is the acme of economic statesmanship to allocate the cost properly to the various benefits so that each may bear its proper proportion of cost. If too great a share is assessed against the land, it foredooms the reclamation project to failure. If, in the new and scarcely developed portions of the West, a major share of the cost is assessed against power production-especially with a view of making power rates in the new West comparable to existing rates in the old East-the project is not likely to be feasible for lack of adequate market and with slim prospects of developing industry to create such market. All of these costs must be very delicately balanced with the ultimate good of the project and the whole country held in view.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Jones], a member of the committee.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this conference report. I think the members of the conference on the House side should be congratulated for bringing in a report that all the conferees on both sides of the aisle can

agree upon. I think it is a forwardlooking and constructive report and provides a constructive program for the Interior Department with all of its many and varied functions.

The statement of the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the House conferees at the conference is correct in every respect. I would like for you to consider the total amount of restorations and additions that have been made on the other side of the Capitol on all appropriation bills, as follows:

Restorations and additions made by the Senate in appropriation bills, 1945-46

	Restorations	
	and	
Departments and agencies:	additions	
Department of Agriculture.	\$18, 291, 827	
District of Columbia	715, 200	
Department of the Interior_	39, 149, 804	
Legislative-judicial	623, 480	
State, Justice, and Com-		
merce	9, 671, 138	
Treasury-Post Office		
War Department — Civil		
functions		
First deficiency	273, 837, 952	
Total to date		
If the Senate Appropriation		
Committee's restoration and		
addition to the war agencies bill stands up, there will be a		
further sum of		
Turther sum Ol	21, 300, 000	
Or total restorations and addi-	San Inches	
Or count restorations and addi-		

The Interior bill conferees have whittled away a sizable sum from this over-all total of raises in the Senate above the House figures in the various appropriation bills above. I think the unanimous action of your conferees has been a substantial saving to the Government that ought to be supported on both sides of the aisle. We might as well be practical and realize that the House conferees have done well to cut \$28,702,174 from the above total of \$377,355,981 that the Senate has added to appropriation bills so far for the 1946 fiscal year.

_ 377, 355, 981

28, 702, 174

tions of____

The following tabulation speaks for itself and is a worthy recommendation of the conferees to hold down public spending of

Interior Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1946

Total amount of Budget esti-

mates	\$143, 839, 147
Amount of bill as agreed to by conferees	111, 690, 258
Reduction under Budget es- timates	32, 148, 889
Amount of bill as passed Sen- ate	140, 392, 432
by conferees	111, 690, 258
Reduction in bill as passed	

Amount by con				111, 690, 258
Amount	of	bill		
House .			 	 101, 242, 628

by Senate____

Increase in bill as originally passed by House_____ 110,447,630

A portion of the increase, \$2,493,100, was estimated for by the Bureau of the Budget after the bill had passed the House and was sent to the Senate in supplemental estimates.

I think the House will agree and go along with the conference report and the amendments in technical disagree-ment to hold the total amount of the bill as agreed upon by your conferees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gen-

tleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here listening to a lot of statements that have been made about the Central Valley water project, the transmission lines, and steam plants. I have heard a lot of loose talk from time to time regarding the activities of the members of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee. I personally had the opportunity on several occasions to go over the Central Valley water project with the members of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee. According to some of the statements that have been made, they would have one believe that these Members of Congress have not been fair to the people of California. I want to commend them and thank them for the many hours of consideration which they have given to California in the past several years. The proof of that is that during that period of time there never has been a shortage of funds at the end of each year for the Department of the Interior for the Central Valley water project.

In 1936 they had a carry-over of \$4 200 000

In 1937 a carry-over of \$10,000,000 or

In 1938 they had over \$20,000,000 carry-over.

In 1939 they had over \$17,000,000.

In 1940 they had over \$6,500,000.

In 1941 they had \$1,431,000. In 1942 they had \$3,423,000

In 1943 they had over \$12,500,000.

In 1944 they had over \$18,500,000.

And in 1945 they had over \$10,800,000. Certainly no one could criticize this committee for seeing to it that there was ample money at all times to carry on the work of this great project. We have had a lot of conversation about the power

features and the transmission lines. I come from a congressional district that will pay for a large portion of the water cost of this project. I think I can truthfully say I am the only member of the California delegation who has had to pay power bills to pump water out of the ground, in the amount of \$400 a month and more for a great many years, to get water on his farm in order to operate. Is there any member of the California delegation who has been paying \$400 a month or more for power? If so, I would like to have them stand so I might see him or her. There is no one. Yet no one can say I am not interested in cheap power. The truth of the matter is the more money we tie onto this project the more the water is going to cost my people.

This project was set up in the first place for the irrigation farmers, where the water had left them. Little consideration has been given to the cost of this project. Some people are interested only in serving themselves selfishly. I say that with emphasis. My people want cheap power just the same as the people in San Francisco or in Mississippi or any

place else, but under this power project of Central Valley we cannot get any of that power in the San Joaquin Valley. It is too far distant from where the power is generated. Had this project been built like it was explained to the people when we voted on it in the State and when this Congress approved it, 50 percent of the power we are now using to pump water would be released for other purposes. In the San Joaquin Valley we have about 15,000 pumping plants ranging from 10 to 150 horsepower each. Do we want cheap power? Certainly we do. But no one has ever attempted to give my farmers cheap electric energy. Time and again my people and I appeared before the Railroad Commission and the power companies in the interest of getting some relief."

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I decline to yield. You served as chairman of that board and did not do anything about it, so do not try to take up my time here.

My people suffered but did anybody give them relief? No.

Mr. HAVENNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I decline to yield. My people time and time again pleaded for assistance while we were spending our last dollar to go down farther into the ground after water. Our power bills increased every time we went farther into the ground after that water. How many of you Members realize that we have spent about \$163,000,000 on this project? What did Mr. Page, head of the Reclamation Bureau say to Mr. RICH back in 1937? I quote the record:

And you figure, Mr. Page, the total cost of all of the dams and all of the power projects is going to be \$170,000,000?

Mr. Page. Yes, sir. That has been care-

fully checked.

Back in 1937 he told the people the project would cost only \$170,000,000. And my people, the San Joaquin Valley people, are going to help pay for the cost of this project. We thought the cost was going to be \$170,000,000. What is now proposed as the cost? It is now said the cost will be about \$350,000,000 or \$360,-000,000. Who is going to pay the bill? Who do you think is going to make up the difference? The taxpayers of the Nation or the water users? The irrigation water users of the southern San Joaquin Valley cannot receive project power on account of distance. They are asked to pay high water rates, to subsidize large users of power in the San Francisco Bay region where most of it must be sold.

The law says power shall be sold to financially aid the project. When those people advocate discounting rates in advance of knowing what the water costs are to be, and what the project costs are to be, they are also advocating that the water users make up the difference or that the taxpayers outside of the project power service area make up the difference.

Oh, I am telling you it is a sad day when Members stand here on the floor and speak, or extend their remarks in the Record trying to convince my people they have not been misled. My people

have been misled from time to time, they have been lied to. I did not believe the Congress of the United States or the Department ever would turn around and deliberately deceive the taxpayers, especially not the number of experienced farmers we have in the San Joaquin Valley; who have been doing their utmost over a period of years to keep their head out of the dirt.

We hear complaints about the cost of power in the city of San Francisco. Utility rates in San Francisco for average family use are the cheapest of 25 large cities in the United States. The average monthly bill in San Francisco is \$7.20; in New York it is \$15.30.

Now, Mr. Speaker, do not get me Whenever it is necessary to conwrong. struct this steam plant and transmission line there is not a Member of this House who will work any harder for that than I, but first I want to know and my people want to know who is going to pay for that increased cost. My people cannot get any of it. So if the people in the bay area are going to receive the benefit from the power project and steam plant then they should say to Congress and the rest of the people in California that they are willing to build the transmission lines from the power plant to the bay area where the power is to be used, the way power is being distributed from Boulder Dam into Los Angeles. Angeles utilities have constructed the transmission lines to get the power to the Los Angeles area. Why ask the people of some other place to pay for benefits they do not receive? My people are going to pay for the water they get from the canals when they are constructed: and we are going to have to pay for the laterals and all the ditches to get it over to our farms. We are not asking the people in the San Francisco and the bay area, and Los Angeles to pay the cost.

Should it become necessary at any time to protect the interests of the Government or the people under the project, the Interior Department has an open door to come to the Congress and justify the need. Until that time can be shown to be even in the probable near future, expenditure of money on plans and surveys would be impractical, unwise and a waste of money. For with the lapse of a few years before any work could be undertaken, new surveys and new plans would undoubtedly have to be made. There is not now and there has not been shown any justifiable need for the Government to spend money on these project features in the forseeable future.

Page 1062 of Senate hearings statement of State Engineer Hyatt says:

There appears to be no immediate necessity for further construction of transmission lines for the project in the near future. The present position of the authority-

California Water Authority-

is unchanged, and the authority desires to reaffirm its position in support of the con-struction of transmission lines and a steam electric plant as integral units of the project, as and when needed.

There should be no more money appropriated for additional power features until such time as the Reclamation Bureau submits an accurate schedule showing the total cost of the project, the

amount to be repaid by the water users, the amount to be repaid from power revenues, and the amount of the cost of the project that is nonreimbursable. That should show the rates for power, what it will return, net to apply on the project costs, what amount, if any, is to be allocated to the local counties in lieu of taxes and compare that with the present tax paid by the private company. It should show the tax paid in by the private company and what equivalent amount from the project will be paid to the Federal Treasury. It is time that this power propaganda is "debunked." Let us have the clear picture before us. Then, if it is necessary to build transmission lines or a steam plant or any other power features, I will be more than willing to advocate them. But, first, before we go any further, I think Congress and the people under the project are entitled to know where we get off on this huge power program planned by the Interior Department brain trusters. The House committee is right in its efforts to protect the people of the project and the Federal taxpayers from unnecessary and very expensive duplication of power lines and

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of anything that has so disturbed me in this Congress as the remarks I have heard about the Central Valley project from time to time, criticizing the members of the Appropriations Committee when they refused to pay attention to somebody trying to pile costs on us. The more they pile on to this project the more the water will cost my people; and I say to you no farmer in the United States can pay a lot for his irrigation water. At the present time we are paying through the nose to the power companies on account of the high-water lift.

How many of you here would have the intestinal fortitude to tell a power company when you were using 60, 70, or 80 horsepower: "To hell with your power; take it off my ranch" in the middle of the summer. That is what I did; and I put in two natural gas engines, and we are still pumping water out of the ground, but we are not getting it from the power companies. So nobody can say I am identified with private power companies. I defied the power company in my own home town. Oh, yes! How many of you would get up and fight them, tell them to take the poles off the ranch or you would chop them down? That is what I did. I did not get shot for it and I did not get defeated when I ran for reelection to this Congress.

I am pleading with you people here not to put any more money into this great project out there until we know what is going to be done with it in the way of transmission lines and steam plants. Mr. Ickes' last report on natural gas and oil in California indicates that more steam plants should not be established there. His report indicates that we may not have enough oil out there, certainly not for another war. Do we want to spend money for a steam plant, fifty or sixty million dollars, to sit idle, something that cannot be used?

Farming this power should wait until we know what the program is to be. We do not know what the program is. The

Department of the Interior has been running up and down the San Joaquin Valley misrepresenting the project, lying to the people; and you taxpayers back here have been paying for those propagandists running up and down the San Joaquin Valley for the last several years putting out lies and misrepresentations. What are you doing about it? Not a thing. You permit them to spread their political philosophy, even to the extent of sending reports back here to the Department of the Interior describing who were at the meetings, whether he was a Democrat or a Republican, whether he was a dairyman or a fruit grower. That is what they have been doing.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that whenever the Federal Government produces power and sells it for less than cost that the farmers who are trying to get some water out there are going to have to pay a great deal more for that water than they should; and the project will take possibly a hundred years to pay for and maybe never under the present situation?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct. want to say to the membership of the House when the time comes and we know what this project is all about, I am for firming the power, but I think it should be done by hydroelectric plants. We have other streams that should be developed, so let us use hydroelectric and not use up our gas and oil. When the people of San Francisco can agree with the Federal Government whether they want to purchase the power privately or through the company, then that is plenty of time to determine whether we want to spend millions of dollars for a transmission line.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. If there is a question in the gentleman's mind as to what benefits the people of his part of the country are going to derive, what benefits does he think my State, that is paying 10 percent of the Federal taxes on a \$300,000,000 job which will cost us \$30,000,000, what will my State of Pennsylvania get out of this thing?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will answer the gentleman by saying that the people of California will pay for it. This project will be self-liquidating over a period of 40 years if it is run right. It will not cost your people 5 cents, but it is costing your people money now for these propagandists to run up and down through the San Joaquin Valley out there spreading all of this propaganda.

The action of the conferees in striking the item of \$300,000 inserted in the bill by the Senate for the Kings River project was a particularly wise one at this time. The Kings River project is fully authorized for construction by the Corps of Army Engineers and is a flood-control The amount of money requested by the Bureau of Reclamation at this time for the purpose of making studies on this project is entirely unnecessary and is greatly in excess of any possible

requirement that would be needed for them to make the studies they are authorized to do on this project.

There is no need for any funds for Bureau studies on this project until such time as the Corps of Engineers completes its plans and awards a contract for the construction. This is a postwar project and the interest of the Reclamation Bureau is solely to assist in the determination of the amount of the cost of the dam which should be charged to the farmers owning the water rights for the storage of flood waters that they will incidentally benefit from.

Mr. GAVIN. We have 250,000 coal miners in Pennsylvania who are mining coal and they have no jobs and will have no work after the war. Every time one of these hydroelectric projects is put in, so many thousands of miners are thrown out of employment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed that portion of the report on the hearings held by the Senate Committee on H. R. 3024 concerning appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation, with especial attention to the section beginning on page 813 and extending to page 914, relating to the Bureau of Reclamation request for funds to develop plans for a transmission line from Shasta Dam and a steam power plant in the Delta Region.

I was quite impressed with the statement and testimony of Mr. Black, president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., until I read the statements and testimony of representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation.

I should like to review briefly some of the controversial issues as they appear to me:

Mr. Black stated: First, that the company's system is the natural outlet for the Central Valley Project's power unless wasteful duplicating lines and other facilities were constructed—page 865. Second, the company is now taking all of the output of the Government's power plant at a rate satisfactory to the Secretary, pages 867 and 869, and third, the Federal Government would receive more money through disposal of its power through the company—page 870.

As to the first point, Mr. Black later stated that the company will add additional facilities for serving the area and has been spending from \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000 annually on new construction-page 884. Mr. Kenneth Markwell, Assistant Reclamation Commissioner, on page 894, stated that the company's present system is not adequate to deliver power to the sites of the new pumping plants. It is clear from this that new facilities must be built to handle Shasta power, which leads to the conclusion that the transmission line proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation is not a wasteful duplication.

As to the second point, Mr. Markwell stated on page 895, that the power company was unable to use some 42,000,000 kilowatt hours of potential power in a 3-month period. It was revealed that the present contract is only a temporary measure and would not be satisfactory over a long period, page 895.

As to the third point, under the existing contract the company will use about 800,000,000 kilowatt-hours at a cost of \$2,700,000 or an average rate of about 3.4 mills-page 868. The Bureau is desirous of delivering an estimated 400,-000,000 kilowatt hours of power annually to the pumping plants at a rate of 2.5 mills-page 896. The company is now receiving 5 mills per kilowatt-hours for similar power-page 901. The Bureau's rate would result in a saving of \$1,000,000 annually to the water users. Apparently the company has offered to deliver Government power to these new pumping plants at the rate of 1 kilowatt-hour for each 134 kilowatt-hours received-page 883. Mr. Black stated that the line loss would be about 10 percent-page 876. Under such a plan the company would receive 700,000,000 kilowatt-hours and deliver only 400,000,000 to the pumping plants. Using a loss figure of 10 percent the company would require only 440,000,000 kilowatt-hours to deliver 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours to the pumps, leaving the company with 260,-000,000 kilowatt-hours of power to pay for its cost of operation, and so forth. At a value of 5 mills this would be worth \$1,300,000 annually.

In addition the company would be the only potential purchaser of power not needed by the Bureau and would be in an advantageous position to acquire the remaining power at a low rate.

Mr. Black stated that the company has a total installation of some 2,000,000 kilowatts—page 886. The combined Government installation will have an ultimate capacity of about 600,000 kilowatts, or less than one-third of the company's. As a large portion of this will be required for pumping plants not now operating, the over-all conflict with the company's present operation will be some lesser value.

In view of the statements by Mr. Black and Mr. Markwell that the normal power load is constantly increasing and that operation of these huge pumping plants is a load created by construction of the Central Valley project, I cannot see that the Bureau's plan will interfere materially with the normal business of the power company.

The Bureau of Reclamation has an enviable record in the development of power facilities in connection with the construction of multiple-purpose projects and I think that its engineers can be relied upon to recommend only that plan which will be to the best advantage of the Central Valley project water users and to the United States.

Congress in the past has given approval to the Central Valley project, including power plants and transmission lines, and I suggest that the appropriation contain funds for investigations and preparation of plans and designs for such transmission lines and power plants as are necessary to complete the project.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

SYNTHETIC FUELS PROGRAM

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in 1944 this Congress passed the synthetic liquid fuels legislation for an authorization of not to exceed \$30,000,000 for construction and operation of demonstration plants. Of that amount \$5,000,000 was appropriated later in that year. We have an additional amount of \$6,000,000 appropriated for the Interior Department in the House bill, which was raised to \$10,000,000 in the Senate bill. I understand a compromise of \$7,000,000 has been reached in the pending conference report. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct, with a \$15,000,000 contract authorization.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am glad that the contract authorization is placed in the measure. Such action is necessary. We are going to need 200,000 barrels of petroleum daily to fight this one-front war in the Pacific in excess of what we needed to fight even a two-front war. It is interesting to know that a B-29 bomber gassed for flight uses more fuel than a railroad tank car can hold. Our oil and gas reserves are being drained by a demand that increases, not alone for war but for essential civilian needs and I hope these synthetic plants shall be built and operated without delay.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired. Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr.

Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, this conference report leaves many items in an inconclusive state. For one thing it is apparent that we need a real study of the allocations of costs on multiple-purpose projects.

I am also sorry to see the several instances where power-transmission lines have been either denied or restricted. It should be apparent to all that power, once generated, must be sold if the Government's investment is protected. To be sold it must be transmitted. Such lines, then, become the very basis of our security as well as progress.

I am likewise disappointed that the revolving fund of \$2,000,000 for use in the land-purchase program for Columbia Basin has been taken out in conference.

Under the Antispeculation Act of 1943, passed by this House, it is necessary for the large tracts of land to be bought up by the Government and resold, as smaller tracts as provided for under that act. That program should be underway now if we are to adequately prepare for the returning veterans.

I am also sorry to see the cut made in the preconstruction survey fund. I hope that that fund will stay at the \$5,500,000 amount allowed by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 2, after line 22, insert:

"DIVISION OF GEOGRAPHY

"Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Division of Geography in

performing the duties imposed upon the Secretary by Executive Order 6680, dated April 17, 1934, relating to uniform usage in regard to geographic nomenclature and orthography throughout the Federal Government, including personal services in the District of Columbia, stationery and office supplies, and printing and binding, \$70,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 5 with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"DIVISION OF GEOGRAPHY

"Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Division of Geography, during the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, and for a period not exceeding 30 days thereafter, in performing the duties imposed upon the Secretary by Erecutive Order 6680, dated April 17, 1934, relating to uniform usage in regard to geographic nomenclature and orthography throughout the Federal Government, including personal services in the District of Columbia, stationery and office supplies, and printing and binding, \$25,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 5, beginning in line 23, strike-out down through line 7 on page 6, and insert the following:

"For all expenses necessary to enable the Bonneville Power Administrator to carry out the duties imposed upon him by the Bonne-ville Act (16 U.S. C., ch. 12B), and Executive Order 8526, August 26, 1940, and to provide for partial surveys and design of transmission lines for the Hungry Horse Dam project (Public Law 329, 78th Cong.), including not to exceed \$20,850 for personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; and purchase (not exceeding 30), maintenance and operation of passenger automobiles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$3,500,000, together with the unexpended balance of funds heretofore made available to the Administrator, to be available until expended, of which amounts not to exceed \$4,206,690 shall be available during the fiscal year 1946 for expenses of marketing, operation of transmission facilities, and administrative costs in connection therewith."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Not to exceed \$3,487,110 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation 'Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system', shall be available under the account for said appropriation in the fiscal year 1946 for expenses of marketing and operation of transmission facilities, and administrative

costs in connection therewith, including \$20,850 for personal services in the District of Columbia, the purchase (not exceeding 30), maintenance, and operation of passenger automobiles, and hire, maintenance, and operation of alreraft: Provided, That funds available for construction of transmission lines shall be available only for the construction of such lines as have been previously authorized by Congress."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Mansfield].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a good many telegrams and communications from northwestern Montana about this amendment which would evidently cut off the proposed Hungry Horse project from the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Grid Systems under the Bonneville Power Administration. I have been informed by these constituents of mine that such an amendment, if adopted, would isolate the Hungry Horse Dam. and that we would not get credit for downstream use of waters, and the project would become less economic and the results less beneficial to the people of our area.

May I ask the chairman of the committee just what his interpretation of this particular amendment is, and if it coincides with what I just said, or if it is something different?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Montana that I am very definitely of the opinion that his people are unduly disturbed about the amendment in question. As the gentleman knows, the Committee on Appropriations allowed \$100,000 for plans for the Hungry Horse project. Of course, he knows that \$100,000 would not complete all of the plans. The Senate raised the amount to \$475,000. The House and the Senate conferees agreed on a compromise of \$200,000 which, of course, was twice the amount allowed by the House. But I am sure the gentleman knows that not all the preliminary work and planning for the Hungry Horse project can be done with that amount; therefore by no stretch of the imagination could there be any need for funds for construction or even for plans and specifications for a transmission line as proposed by the bill as it passed the Senate. Therefore the committee is not turning thumbs down, as we might say, on the transmission line, but merely postponing the construction of it in the present bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the chairman of the committee. I am sorry that the committee did not see fit to accept the Senate amendment concerning the Hungry Horse as outlined in amendment No. 11 and I am also disappointed that the full sum of \$475,000 requested by both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Budget Bureau was not agreed to. Is it your opinion then that it might be possible next winter to ask for a deficiency appropritaion if the need is shown?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say to the gentleman that no Member of this House knows his way to the deficiency committee any better than does the distinguished gentleman, and no man

is more effective in securing funds than is the able gentleman from Montana. I happen to a be a member of the deficiency committee and am very sympathetic with the Hungry Horse project. But I, of course, am in no position to speak for that great committee or predict what action it would take on this or any other matter.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield. Mr. ANGELL. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee in just what respect his motion modifies the position taken by the Senate with respect to Bonneville?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As I explained to the gentleman from Montana the committee simply eliminated that proposal in the Bonneville item which would provide for plans and specifications for transmission lines, which the committee felt was not actually needed at this time.

Mr. ANGELL. That would apply also to any other transmission line in addition to those of the Hungry Horse project?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, no, it has reference only to the Hungry Horse project and those not heretofore authorized by Congress.

Mr. ANGELL. What is the amount of money which will be available during the next fiscal year for the marketing of the power from the Bonneville Dam?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman there is now on hand a surplus of more than \$17,000,000 any part of which can be used for construction if made available. Three million four hundred and eighty-seven thousand dollars has been made available in this bill for operation and maintenance which the committee felt was ample.

Mr. ANGELL. How does the motion which the gentleman has offered differ from the amount which was provided in the Senate amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. We simply eliminated that amount for transmission lines for the Hungry Horse project which no one contends is needed at this time, and prohibit the construction of lines not heretofore authorized by Congress.

Mr. ANGELL. Is that the only change?

I would like to say to our distinguished chairman that Columbia River power, marketed through the Bonneville administration, is making a tremendous contribution to the war effort. After the war ends, there will be need for much work to provide markets for this power in postwar civilian industries and for farm and domestic uses. It would be unwise to deny to the Bonneville administration sufficient funds to expand its marketing facilities and its distribution lines. I trust the committee has not made any material cut in the funds that will be available for these purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we approve the Senate amendments with respect to the Bonneville administration items.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I believe the Senate recommended a larger amount, but they compromised on the House figure.

Mr. COFFEE. Was not the compromise \$200,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is

the compromise we reached on the Hungry Horse reclamation item. The compromise on funds for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville Power Administration was \$3,487,000. Senate figure was \$4,206,690.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Then it is the statement of the chairman of the committee that this particular money was refused in conference and that this amendment which you are making is taking from the construction of transmission lines to the Hungry Horse area only?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Only; that is correct. That applies, of course, to this appropriation only.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. in turn it can be reconsidered when the

need is made obvious?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes. I will say that all of the gentlemen now standing also know their way to the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee and usually get the money when they can show real need.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COFFEE. Are there any other amendments; that is, are there any other points in dispute with respect to the Bonneville Power Administration in this

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I believe not.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield. Mr. SAVAGE. With respect to the question concerning Bonneville, which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Coffeel asked, what is allowed for advance research and marketing?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I be-

lieve \$127,000 is allowed.

Mr. SAVAGE. That is only one-half of 1 percent for advance marketing. I think most progressive private organizations allow around 3 percent for advance marketing.

I understand the Department asked for 11/2 percent. It seems to me onehalf percent is liable to jeopardize the Bonneville project. It was enough in the last year because all the power was going into the war effort. But now I feel that since some of the great war industries are shutting down, such as the Kaiser shipyard, for example, it may result in a tremendous surplus on our hands with no place to market the surplus power.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say to the gentleman, as I have indicated, this is the same amount which was allowed last year. Now, if the situation should change within the next few months or several months, I will say the gentleman also knows his way to the Deficiency Appropriation Subcommittee.

I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Mur-DOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has made a clear statement, and has indicated that the men who are on their feet seeking recognition are men from the Northwest who know their way to the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee. That is largely correct. However, I want to say the chairman of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation is also vitally interested in this measure and also this item in it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And the gentleman also knows his way to the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee, and comes there very frequently.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield. Mr. HOLMES of Washington. the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma comment upon the question about the withdrawal of \$2,332,000 of appropriations in the conference for the Columbia River Basin, which is very much needed for the purpose of getting the Columbia River Basin land program under way? I am definitely in favor of the entire Budget recommendation of \$8,332,000 and regret that the conference agreed to an appropriation of \$6,000,000. If this sum had not been agreed to and was left in controversy by the conference, I would immediately offer an amendment to restore the \$8,332,000. This, of course, is impossible now without rejecting the entire conference report. Parliamentary procedure does not permit the opportunity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have been tremendously interested in that project, that is, the land-acquisition project, but because of the fact that we are still at war and we cannot assume that this war will be over within the next year the committee felt that now was not the time to make that money available.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Is it primarily the element of time and not necessarily prejudice on the part of the committee? Is that true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I feel sure that is true. It is certainly true as far as the chairman of the subcommittee is concerned. I think it is one of the most desirable locations for this purpose. I have never visited the area, but, judging from the evidence I have heard. I am sure there will be hundreds of veterans for every acre that is available. They will be clamoring to get to that area to settle.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Of course, we who are very much interested in that project are aware of the fact that the veterans will be coming into that area and we are much interested in getting this program under way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. thing that disturbed the committee was this: It seems that under the present plans the cost of putting water on he lands is going to be tremendous, considering the leveling of the land and all of the expenses necessary to getting the land in shape for homesteading. I sincerely hope that the expenses will not be as large as present indications would seem.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman vield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield. Mr. MURDOCK. I have seen that land in the eastern part of the State of Washington. I regard it as one of the few prize spots in America which can quickly be converted into homes for the benefit of veterans. I want to call to mind the fact that a recent survey among the armed forces shows that 850,000 men in our armies today want homes on the land. This is one of the places for them. We ought to develop it adequately and quickly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to the chairman of the Committee on Reclamation who I understand, actually believes that Arizona is the garden spot of the world, that when he makes such an admission as he has just made, that the eastern part of the State of Washington must be a real garden spot.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I think it shows the astute judgment of the chairman of the Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation.

Will the gentleman Mr. JENSEN. yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield. Mr. JENSEN. Regarding the \$2,000,-000 which the committee withheld for the purchase of land in the Columbia Valley Basin, I wish to add this, that because of the fact there is such an enormous charge against the water rights, we had hoped that within the next year the Reclamation Bureau would level out their rates and charges to such a degree that you people in that valley can make that land available for returning veterans so that they can go on a farm and have a chance to pay out, instead of having such an enormous amount charged against your irrigation projects.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. We think that the maximum of \$85 per acre contemplated construction cost for bringing water upon the land is written on a sound financial basis.

Mr. JENSEN. I might say in answer to that statement that we are afraid your \$85 an acre will be defeated unless we can get the Federal power rates in order, because we do not see how it can pay out under the present rate structure.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I thank the gentlemen from Oklahoma and Iowa for their comments.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I always yield to the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the much beloved and able gentleman from Illinois, who also has the distinction of being the dean of the House

Mr. SABATH. In view of that compliand in view of what has been stated by the gentleman relative to reclamation, I wish to say that an application has been made for a rule on a bill that would bring about increased reclamation and much needed reclamation, that will take care of a great many of the returning brave and courageous men. What I am interested in is to know just what is being provided. If I am not correctly informed I hope I will be corrected. The original bill called for about \$101,000,-000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes, that is approximately the correct figure as the bill was originally passed by the House.

Mr. SABATH. And it has been increased by the Senate, and in the conference report now before us it is about \$111,000,000, being increased by about \$10.000.000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; that also is approximately correct.

Mr. SABATH. I shall not object to the increase or to the appropriation because I believe it will be under the jurisdiction of one of the most capable gentlemen, the Secretary of the Interior, in whom I, and I know the country, has the most confidence. I would like to know, as I have been away for a little while and did not have a chance to study the bill, how much of the \$111,000,000 in the bill has been allocated or appropriated or provided for the State of Illinois or for the city of Chicago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman usually asks interesting, and of course, appropriate questions, but in this instance he has propounded a rather complicated, three-pronged question. The gentleman's first inquiry was about the original bill called for. He asked if it did not call for about \$101,000,000, and I answered that that was approximately correct. The fact is that the Budget estimates called for over \$141,-000,000. This House committee reduced the estimate to \$102,000,000. Then the gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol increased the appropriation to more than \$140,000,000. For the past week or 10 days the House and Senate conferees have been in long daily conferences. As a result of that the Senators receded on nearly \$29,000,000, an unheard of thing as far as Interior Department appropriation bills are concerned. So the bill is now \$32,000,000 below Eudget estimates. And then my good friend the gentleman from Illinois pays a glowing tribute to one of his distinguished con-stituents, who is still holding down the job as Secretary of Interior.

As to whether the gentleman from Illinois and I agree in all particulars in reference to the gentleman who is presently Secretary of the Interior, there may be a slight question; but the gentleman from Illinois and I can agree wholeheartedly as to the importance of that particular office.

Mr. SABATH. We should.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Finally, I may say that the question of what funds, if any, will go to the great State of Illinois and the city of Chicago is a matter that is problematical; but the gentleman usually gets his part of any funds due to the great State of Illinois that he so ably represents.

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman will yield for another minute, I want to congratulate the gentleman for the splendid

work he and his fellow conferees have done. They have succeeded much better with the Senators than most conference committees. For that reason I regret very much that we may not in the future have the gentleman from Oklahoma to fight for the rights of the House in trying to hold down appropriations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say that I am profoundly grateful to my good friend for his overgenerous reference to my activities in Congress. Perhaps I should remind my friend from Illinois that I have not yet sung my swan song. This bill does not ring down the curtain on my rather extended congressional activities. I still have a considerable amount of unfinished congressional business, and I feel a deep obligation to the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Oklahoma, who have been so good to me.

Mr. SABATH. I do not want to say good-by. I hope the gentleman will not accept the proferred judgeship, because I believe he can render greater service here. What I have in mind is this: I am going to vote for the bill with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction, knowing that the rights of the House and the

country have been protected.

What I want to know is how these gentlemen who will be benefitted by these provisions will vote when we ask a small appropriation to take care of the children of the country who are sadly in need of fresh milk, which I am told now is plentiful, especially since we have permitted an increase in price to the farmer. The cows have taken notice of it; they are giving more milk. In some instances it is claimed that milk is being poured into the sewers. We do not want to see that waste; we want some of it at least to go to the children, who should have it. We will have a bill here shortly providing a small sum of money for the socalled lunch milk for the children of our schools and I hope those gentlemen whom we help on this bill by our support will in return for our cooperation vote with us when the matter comes up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me say to the gentleman that he has made a very serious appeal on a very serious subject. I cannot speak for the members of my committee on the bill to which he refers; but I am glad to tell the gentleman that I have always supported the hot-lunch program in which he is so deeply interested. I am glad to say that my people in Oklahoma and throughout the West want to help feed his hungry and starving citizens in Chicago and elsewhere.

Mr. SABATH. Children.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; hungry children anywhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentle-man from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 14. Page 7, line 21, after the word "household;" add the following: "; and the appropriation contained in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1945, for the United States High Commissioner to

the Philippine Islands is hereby continued available for the same objects until June 30, 1946."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "; and the appropriations contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945, and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1945, for the United States High Commissioner to the Phillippine Islands are hereby continued available for the same objects until June 30, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, let me say at this point that there are quite a number of amendments which technically are in disagreement although in fact there is no controversy whatever as to their disposition. Nevertheless as I have said, under the rules they must be shown in disagreement.

Actually, the conferees are in agreement on all of these amendments. In order to expedite action on those amendments on a motion to recede and concur, I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered together. My-request applies to the following Senate amendments: Nos. 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 57, 61, 103, 107, 115, 121, 125, 134, 135, 140, 147½, 158, 159, 164, 214, 217, 219, 221½, 222, 228, 229, 232, 233, 236, 237, 238, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 248, 250, 251, 253, 257, 260, 265, 268, 270, 275, 278, 279, 287, 300, 306, 311, and 321.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman

from Oklahoma?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I tried my best to tally the amendments as the gentleman from Oklahoma read them off. As near as I can tell his request covers only those where the motion will be to recede and concur, and included none of those where it is proposed to concur with an amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is

correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendments referred to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 8, line 23, insert the following: ", including the employment, without regard to civil-service and classification laws, of a Deputy Administrator at not to exceed \$10,000 per annum and not to exceed 28 technical employees."

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 9, line 6, insert "reimbursement at not to exceed 3 cents per mile of employees for expenses incurred by them in official travel in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations; contract stenographic reporting services; newspapers; office supplies; furniture and equipment; maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles; and the acceptance nd utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services."

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 10, line 14, insert "contract stenographic reporting services.

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 10, line 23, insert ": Provided, That this appropriation shall be available for expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equip-ment stored therein for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Grazing Service, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) to be reimbursed, to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Grazing Service," current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured, from the appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment."

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 11, line 10, insert:

"Fire fighting: For fighting and preventing fires on or threatening lands under Grazing Service administration, \$50,000, which amount shall also be available for meeting obligations of the preceding fiscal year."

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 34, line 11,

"For settlement of claims to water rights in the Gila River, Ariz., \$114,400, reimbursable, of which amount \$104,400 shall be paid to the Buckeye Irrigation Co. and \$10,000 shall be paid to the Arlington Canal Co.: Provided, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be paid until appropriate contracts shall have been executed by and between the Secretary of the Interior and the Buckeye Irrigation Co. and the Arlington Canal Co.: Provided further, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be paid until (a) an appropriate contract providing for repayment of the proportionate amount properly chargeable to non-Indian lands in the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District shall have been executed by the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and (b) an appropriate resolution shall have been adopted by the Gila River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Council consenting the charge of the proportionate amount of the sum herein appropriated as construction costs against all Indian lands within the San Carlos Indian irrigation project, subject to the provisions of the act of July 1, 1932 (25 U. S. C. 386a)."

Senate amendment No. 61: Page 34, line 11, insert "and to remain available until completion of the projects: Provided."
Senate amendment No. 103: Page 44, line 1.

insert "and to remain available until June 30, 1947."

Senate amendment No. 107: Page 45, line 22, insert "And to remain available until June 30, 1947."

Senate amendment No. 114: Page 46, line 24, insert "And to remain available until June 30, 1947."

Senate amendment No. 115: Page 46, line 25, insert:

"Expenses incident to fulfilling the Atoka agreement: For all necessary expenses in connection with negotiation of a contract (including holding of an election) with the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians in Oklahoma for purchase by the United States of present right, title, and interest of such Indians in the land and mineral deposits reserved from allotment in accordance with the provisions of section 58 of the act entitled 'An act to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians, and for other purposes,' approved July 1, 1902, \$20,000; to remain available until expended; including \$2,000 for printing and binding, and \$5,000 for transfer to the Geological Survey for appraisal expenses."

Senate amendment No. 121: Page 49, line 23, insert "Provided, That expenditures here-under may be made without regard to sec-

tion 3709, Revised Statutes, or to the act of

May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), as amended." Senate amendment No. 125: Page 52, line 5, insert "except that the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of Wyoming may not exceed \$8 per diem and when in the District of Columbia or Chicago, Ill., \$10 per diem as heretofore provided.

Senate amendment No. 134: Page 58, line 11, insert "payment of damages caused to the owners of lands or other private property of any kind by reason of the operations of the United States, its officers or employees, in the survey, construction, operation, or maintenance of irrigation works.

Senate amendment No. 135: Page 58, line 18, insert "payment of rewards, when specifically authorized by the Secretary, for in-formation leading to the apprehension and convistion of persons found guilty of the theft, damage, or destruction of public prop-

Senate amendment No. 140: Page 61, line 19, insert "and the payment to the school district or school districts serving Mason City and Coulee Dam, Wash., as reimbursement for instruction during the 1945-46 school year in the schools operated by said district or districts of each pupil who is a dependent of any employee of the United States living in or in the vicinity of Coluee Dam, in the sum of \$25 per semester per pupil in average daily attendance at said schools, payable after the term of instruction in any semester has been completed, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

Senate amendment No. 1471/2: Page 64, line 20, insert "from which expenditures may be made for land leveling, construction of farm ditches on units of public lands, production of soil-building crops, and the preparation of raw public lands for irrigation farming, any such expenditures to be charged into the construction costs to be repayable by the lands benefited, and any sums received from the sale of crops or otherwise as a result of these operations to be credited to such construction costs."

Senate amendment No. 158: Page 66, line 21, insert ", and payment to the Boulder City School District as reimbursement for instruction during the 1945-46 school year in the schools operated by said district of each pupil who is a dependent of any employee of the United States, living in or in the immediate vicinity of Boulder City, in the sum of \$45 per semester per pupil in average daily attendance at said schools, payable after the term of instruction in any semester has been completed, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary.'

Senate amendment No. 159: Page 67, line 16, insert "; for land leveling, construction of farm ditches on units of public lands, production of soil-building crops, and other necessary expenses in the preparation of raw public lands for irrigation farming, any such expenditures to be charged into the construction costs to be repayable by the lands benefited, and any sums received from the sale of crops or otherwise as a result of these operations to be credited to such construction costs, to be immediately available.'

12, insert "to remain available until ex-pended." Senate amendment No. 164: Page 68, line

Senate amendment No. 214: Page 80, line 11, insert after the word "special" the words "wearing apparel and."

Senate amendment No. 217: Page 81, line 2, after the word "expenses" insert "without regard to section 3709, revised statutes."
Senate amendment No. 219: Page 81, line

12, after the word "otherwise" insert out regard to civil-service and classification

Senate amendment No. 2211/2: Page 81, line 21, insert "to remain available until ex-

Senate amendment No. 222: Page 82, line 14, after the word "shared", insert a colon

and the following: ": Provided further, That, in addition to the amount herein appropriated, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for additional work not exceeding a total of \$15,-000,000 during the period covered by the aforesaid act, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and appropriations hereafter made for the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels shall be considered available for the purpose of discharging the obligations so created.

Senate amendment No. 228: Page 85, line 8, after the word "expenses", insert "without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes."

Senate amendment No. 229: Page 86, line 7, insert "not to exceed \$75,000 for temporary employment of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof, by contract or otherwithout regard to civil-service and classification laws, necessary to carry out the provisions of this appropriation.

Senate amendment No. 232: Page 86, line 18, insert "to accept buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources."

Senate amendment No. 233: Page 87, line 6, after the word "expenses", insert a comma and the following: ", without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes."

Senate amendment No. 236: Page 87, line 25, after the word "authorized", insert "to accept buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources offering to cooperate in carrying out the purpose of this appropriation.'

Senate amendment No. 237: Page 88, line 8, after the word "necessary", insert ", without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes."

Senate amendment No. 238: Page 88, line 15, after the word "units", insert "not to exceed \$30,000 for temporary employment of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof, by contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, that are necessary to design and construct the buildings and plant units."

Senate amendment No. 241: Page 89, line 3,

insert "without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes."

Senate amendment No. 242: Page 89, line 22, after the word "expenses", insert "without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes."

Senate amendment No. 243: Page 90, line 7, after the word "plants", insert 'including not to exceed \$30,000 for temporary employment of engineers, architects, or firms, or corporations thereof, by contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws necessary to design and construct the buildings and pilot plants."

Senate amendment No. 244: Page 90, line 22, after the word "authorized", insert "to accept buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources for the purposes hereof."

Senate amendment No. 245: Page 91, line 3, after the word "expenses", insert "without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes.

Senate amendment No. 248: Page 91, line 19, insert "to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources for the purposes hereof."

Senate amendment No. 250: Page 92, line 8, strike out the word "Federal."

Senate amendment No. 251: Page 92, line 8, insert "public or private."

Senate amendment No. 253: Page 93, line , after "Provided", insert "That section 3709, Revised Statutes, shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation, or to the appropriation for development and operation of helium properties (special fund) in section 3 (c) of the act of September 1, 1937 (50 U. S. C. 164)."

Senate amendment No. 257: Page 96, line 17, after "California" insert "maintenance of approximately 21/4 miles of roads comprising those portions of the Fresno-Kings Canyon approach road, Park Ridge Lookout Road, and Ash Mountain-Advance truck trail, necessary to the administration and protection of the Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks."

Senate amendment No. 260: Page 97, line 14, after the word "improvement", insert "including the maintenance of structures on the former Cape Hatteras Light Station Reservation within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area project."

Senate amendment No. 265: Page 99, line 8, after the word "measures", insert "including necessary local transportation and subsistence in kind of persons selected for employment or as cooperators, serving without other compensation while attending fire-protection training camps in connection with the fire-control programs of the National Park Service."

Senate amendment No. 268: Page 100, line 12, after the word "Area", insert "Chesapeake & Ohio Canal."

Senate amendment No. 270: Page 101, line 6, after the word "therein" insert the words "and vicinity."

Senate amendment No. 275: Page 103, line 2, after the word "mussels;", insert "development, recommendation, and application of means, including the construction of devices, to assure natural propagation and maximum survival of hatchery and other fishes."

Senate amendment No. 278: Page 104, line 4, after the word "thereof", insert "including investigations, study and research with respect to the utilization of packed sardines and the development of methods and procedures which should be employed in improving the quality and appearance of packed sardines."

Senate amendment No. 279: Page 104, line 8, insert "maintenance, repair, alteration, improvement, equipment, and operation of laboratories and vessels."

Senate amendment No. 287: Page 106, line 4, after the figures "426", insert "including not to exceed \$3,000 for the purchase of printed bags, tags, and labels."

Senate amendment No. 300: Page 110, line 4, insert "In addition to the airplanes authorized for purchase in the foregoing items, the Fish and Wildlife Service may acquire not to exceed 10 surplus airplanes from any disposal agency of the Government without reimbursement or transfer of funds."

Senate amendment No. 306: Page 115, line 4, after the word "Governor", insert ": Provided, That the executive assistant to the Governor and the legal counsel shall be appointed by the Governor."

Senate amendment No. 311: Page 119, line 8, insert ", and payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members."

Senate amendment No. 321: Page 120, line 13, strike out "11" and insert in lieu thereof "12"

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 25, line 3, insert "; and the authorization of \$600,000 in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, for loans from said revolving fund to individual Indians and Indian organizations otherwise ineligible to participate therein is hereby increased to \$1,000,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in line 6 of said amendment, insert "\$750,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 64: On page 37, after line 9, insert "not exceeding \$25,000 for cooperation with the State of Oklahoma for the construction, equipment, and maintenance of an Indian arts and crafts building at Anadarko, Okla."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "not exceeding \$25,000 for cooperation with the State of Oklahoma for the construction and equipment of an Indian arts and crafts building at Anadarko, Okla."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 65: Page 37, line 16, strike out "\$5,392,190" and insert "\$5,540,765."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$5.417.190."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 123: Page 51, line 4, after the word "Council", insert the following: "and no other funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Interior Department shall be expended for the compensation or expenses of an attorney for the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 123, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "under a contract to be entered into between said tribal attorney and the Osage Tribal Council, which contract shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to know if I understand correctly that the amendment the chairman has just offered results in one thing, and that is there will be an attorney representing the Government the same as in the past and an attorney to be employed and paid for out of the Osage tribal funds resulting from a contract by the Osage Tribal Council, to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior or the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman that that is exactly what this amendment provides. He understands the situation correctly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 129: Page 54, line 20, strike out "\$588.190" and insert "\$1,890,-000, to remain available until expended, of which \$150,000 shall be a part of the authorization contained in section 10 (c) of the Federal Ald Highway Act of 1944 (Public Law 521, 78th Cong., approved December 20, 1944)."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$900,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What was the reason for the proposal by the Senate that \$150,000 shall be a part of the appropriation contained in the Federal Highway Act and why was it dropped?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As I recall, \$150,000 was the amount available across the Klamath Indian Reservation. It made it available for that purpose only.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And the amendment that we are now to adopt leaves that out and makes no charge against the new authorization?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 145: Page 63, line 19, insert "and to remain available until expended."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 145, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ", to remain available until expended for carrying out projects (including the construction of transmission lines) or investigations previously or herein authorized by Congress."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 154: Page 65, line 15, strike out all of lines 15, 16, 17, and 18,

and insert the following:

"General investigations: For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and surveys, investigations, and other activities relating to reconstruction, rehabilitation, extensions, or financial adjustments of existing projects, and studies of water conservation and development plans, such investigations, surveys, and studies to be carried on by said Bureau either independently, or in cooperation with State agencies and other Federal agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, and the Federal Power Commission, \$5,500,000, which may be used to execute detailed surveys, to prepare construction plans and specifications, and to perform work preliminary to construction of authorized projects: Provided, That the expenditure of any sums from this appropriation for investigations of any nature requested by States, municipalities, or other interests shall be upon the basis of the State, municipality, or other interest advancing at least 50 percent of the estimated cost of such investigations."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In line 10 of said amendment, strike out the sum of "\$5,500,000", and insert "\$2,250,-

In line 11, after "surveys", insert "and" and in lines 12 and 13, strike out ", and to perform work preliminary to construction of authorized projects."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Murdock].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I regret to see this cut below the Senate appropriation of \$5,500,000—a cut to less than half of that amount. I think this is a key item for the Reclamation Service. I think the service will be hampered in the great work that lies ahead for the Bureau of Reclamation with only the amount offered in the amendment.

Why do I think this is such a significant item in all of the lists of items for the Bureau of Reclamation? Because the widely expanding scope of reclamation in the postwar period depends upon more surveys and a far more detailed study of the physical possibilities throughout the West. There can be no doubt that a greatly expanded program is imperatively needed, as well as being proposed, at this time by the Depart-

ment. I can give some indication of that expanded program, which I should like to do.

As chairman of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I asked the Commissioner of Reclamation some weeks ago to furnish the committee an inventory of possible reclamation projects suitable for development in the postwar period. Such an inventory is found in part I of the hearings on H. R. 520, a bill for settlement of returning veterans on farms in reclamation projects, these items being furnished in hearings held last April. And what do these tabulations show?

This information furnished reveals that the Bureau has listed 415 possible projects in the 17 Western States, arranged in 3 different classifications, according to their condition. It is revealed that the Bureau officials believe that by developing our water resources to the uttermost it would be possible to irrigate and additional 21,000,000 acres of land in the 17 Western States. Without their being definite as to how long a period of time might be required to complete such a development, it is estimated that these 415 projects might cost between four and five billion dollars. Now, the great majority of these projects are in the first. or so-called "study" stage, which means that they are very far from the "blueprint" stage. Of course, any presentation today is merely tentative. Much engineering study and investigation, and some that is not purely engineering, will have to be done before development work can proceed. From this it may be seen that money for general investigation is the basis of further progress in carrying out the program.

And why is this a critical time? Because the Nation is confronted with some of the most pressing economic problems-and social problems-greater than it has ever faced before. It makes every responsible person shudder to think what could happen after this war. We know that there must be a relatively high degree of employment here for the very safety of our country. I prefer to call it full employment and to think of it as an absolute necessity, if we are not to have an economic collapse. Hundreds of thousands of persons in uniform will be returning to civilian life, to all of whom we have promised jobs and to many of whom we have promised homes on the land. Unless we handle this problem in a big way, these promises will fail of fulfillment. There never has been a time in the pioneering history of America where so much is expected by so many as is expected of us in the right kind of legislation and appropriation for this reclamation development. I beseech you not to take a narrow view of our opportunities and responsibilities in this work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Fernandez].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the parliamentary situation is at the present time. I do not know whether the motion has been carried or not. I saw the gentleman from Arizona standing by the gentleman from

Oklahoma and I thought he was to be recognized to make some inquiries which we wanted to make of the chairman with respect to this amendment. Of course, if the motion has carried then I should like to have unanimous consent to inquire into this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will be glad to answer any question I can.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire whether the amendment has been passed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment has not been passed.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Then may I inquire of the chairman of the committee: As I understand, the Bureau of the Budget had approved \$5,500,000 which the Senate put in; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The Bureau of the Budget approved a higher figure. I believe that is the correct

igure: yes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. And in offering this amendment which the committee has offered, I was wondering whether the committee had taken into consideration the situation which confronts at the present time with respect to investigations of these various projects. If the amount is cut down then the projects must be taken piecemeal and the purpose of putting in that figure as approved by the Budget Bureau was to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to make an investigation of all the projects up and down the Rio Grande, for example, so that the people of Colorado and Texas and the people below and above certain projects may be protected. As I understand the law, when a project is finally approved by the Bureau of Reclamation they are then authorized to proceed unless the Governor of the State or the State, through its officials, makes objection. Now, the Governor of my State, for example, cannot make objections until certain other projects are investigated. Yet, if we do not have enough money to investigate these projects, we are stymied. That is the reason for requesting this amount. For example, in the San Joaquin River there is a project proposed which was pretty well along as to investigation for the diversion of water from the San Juan River over to the Rio Grande. The people below that proposed project have certain projects investigations on which have also been started but which cannot be finished unless we have sufficient money to carry on the work at the same time the work of investigation on the San Juan diversion dam is carried on.

I believe if these thigs were taken into consideration we should be allowed a little higher amount so that that can be done. Also if the projects are to be put in readiness the work preliminary to construction should be provided for. Perhaps that can be delayed until all the projects have been investigated, but if that is done, then, when they are ready to proceed, there will be considerable delay because plans and specifications and drillings and borings will have to be made, which means that at that period which is the time when our boys will be coming back and needing immediate work there will be a further delay until the planning work preliminary to construction can be done before we can put them to work. I would like to inquire if those things have been taken into consideration, Mr. Speaker, and whether there will be a possibility of permitting us to have at least \$3,500,000 for this work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman has made a very splendid statement. I am going to answer his inquiry frankly and somewhat in detail.

Yes: I will say to the gentleman from New Mexico, the committee did take those things into consideration.

Let us go back a little bit. Because of the fact that we are still at war and do not know how long the war is going to last, and being afraid that it will not end as soon as we hope it will, the House Appropriations Committee made available \$1,485,000 for this particular matter of investigation on a point of order in the House that amount was reduced to \$125,000. The Senate increased that to something like \$5,500,000. In addition to that it also increased another item for the Missouri Valley which we did not have in the bill last year.

Let me say that the amount in the bill now for this item of \$2,250,000 is about twice as much as the Bureau of Reclamation had for the current year for the same purpose. Now, add to that the Missouri Valley project, for which there is also included in this bill, \$3,200,-000; also \$500,000 for surveys and investigations from the Colorado River development fund; and add to that the portion of the unexpended balance of \$1,645,000 for water-conservation projects which will be available and we have a grand total, not of \$2,250,000, but nearly \$7,000,000 which will be expended for reclamation investigations during the next fiscal year, which is more than five times the amount that it had during the current year. Therefore I will say that considering the grand total which we have for investigation throughout the West, the committee has been more liberal on this item than any other item in the entire bill. The committee did take into consideration what the gentleman said and it took into consideration these other matters also.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Will

the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield. Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I am deeply concerned about this matter. I listened with a great deal of attention and interest to what the gentleman has just said. Do I understand the gentleman correctly that in addition to this \$2,250,000 which you are offering as an amendment for perconstruction survey moneys there is an unexpended balance of \$1.640,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There is an unexpended balance of \$1,645,000. but that comes under water utilities conservation. A substantial portion of it can be used for surveys.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Can that be used for preconstruction survey money by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is also for construction purposes.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Can it be used for the purpose of making studies

of projects to get them from the study stage over into the approved and authorized stage?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If they come under water-conservation projects it is my understanding it can be.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I feel that the preconstruction-survey money as outlined by the Bureau of the Budget and recommended by the Bureau of the Budget to the House committee, and replaced in the bill by the Senate, was forthcoming on a sound basis. This is the procedure, is it not, resorted to by the Rivers and Harbors Committee and other committees handling large-scale construction programs like the Bureau of Reclamation in the Interior Department?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes; I think that is correct.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Does the gentleman think the preconstruction survey fund of \$5,500,000 is excessive?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not think it is excessive, but there are many things we would like to put into this bill that were not excessive. However, the committee took other things into consideration and felt it was very liberal when it gave several times as much money as it had during the current year.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman vield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield. Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman's statement is rather comforting to me, yet I am puzzled. I wonder whether the case is as favorable as indicated. Is the chairman correct in saying that about \$7,000,000 of unexpended balance, including this amendment, is available to the Bureau of Reclamation for this purpose? If so, I am almost satisfied.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, No. I do not say it is all available to the Bureau of Reclamation, but it is for the purpose of water conservation in the West.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Is it for preconstruction survey moneys for the Bureau of Reclamation? Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, no.

I did not say that.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield. Mr. FERNANDEZ. Here is the situation: Up to this time the money has been so restricted that the Bureau of Reclamation cannot carry on all of these projects so that they can all be considered in toto. It has to limit itself to certain main projects as money is available. The result is that when they get through with that, the people up and down the river, above or below such proposed project, are unable to determine whether or not that should be approved. My State has to make an expression before a project is approved within New Mexico. Yet that State will not be able to do so until other projects are investigated. amount that the Missouri Valley will have will not help us any on that proposition. The amount of over a million dollars carry-over mentioned by the chairman is not available for that purpose. Only a small amount is available for that purpose. It is the investigations up and down the river on the various projects, and how they will correlate,

that is necessary so that the people in the West may be advised, so that the rights of the people in Colorado, the people in Texas, and the people in Arizona may be protected before one or two or more projects are approved and others left out. I know it is hard to do, but it must be done if we are going to get anywhere with that work in the West. We are already behind. New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado are behind on these projects because they have been taken up piecemeal. I think that is the reason why the Senate allowed the amount that the Bureau of the Budget approved. I believe we ought to have at least \$3,500,-000, if not the \$5,500.00

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There were some Members who felt we were going entirely too high. It was nearly twice as much as the House Appropriations Committee gave originally, but this was the best agreement that we could reach. This was a compromise. It is almost twice what they had for the

current year.

Mr. HORAN. Will the gentleman vield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield. Mr. HORAN. Will the gentleman tell me what the original Budget estimate

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. million five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HORAN. The Budget allowed \$5,-500.000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes, sir. Mr. FERNANDEZ. We think we need that, but in a spirit of compromise we would be willing to agree to \$3,500,000. That will not do what we want to do. but it will give us enough information so that the people in New Mexico, for example, through their Governor, can speak with respect to the projects which they are required to speak about before they are submitted for consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman has made a very splendid statement. I will say to the gentleman the committee has given very serious consideration to this item.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield. Mr. HOLMES of Washington. to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I think it is very important that we consider this \$5,500,000 Budget-approved fund to take care of the tremendous amount of preconstruction survey that has necessarily got to take place in the postwar program. I for one want to go very definitely on record in favor of the \$5,500,000 and not \$3,500,000 or \$2,250,-000. I think this is the time we should understand that the preconstruction survey moneys are exceedingly necessary to the postwar program to enable us to bring these projects into the approved and authorized stage.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield. Mr. HORAN. Were there several categories of Budget estimates, one based on VE, one on VJ, and one "war over" and that sort of thing?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As I recall, the original estimates were submitted on the basis of a two-front war.

Mr. HORAN. We people out in the West have a feeling that when the war is over reclamation is going to enter into the picture very much, and therefore we will have to come back and ask for additional funds for this survey work; and I wondered if it had been considered by the gentleman's committee in several categories

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I imagine all members of the committee have suspected that the distinguished gentlemen who are standing, and some who have been standing, who are interested in reclamation would probably be back again and again and again.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I wish to tell the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I will be one of those who will be back on these matters for deficiency appropriations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And the gentleman is usually very effective when he comes before the committee.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact the gentleman has been somewhat liberal, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from New Mexico?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman desires to offer an amendment it is his privilege.

The SPEAKER. It is not his privilege unless the gentleman yields for that purpose.

Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from New Mexico for the purpose of offering an amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have not the privilege from my committee to yield for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 155: Page 66, line 13, strike out "\$6,758,500" and insert "\$15,-633.500.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amend-

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 155, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$9,783,-

The motion was agreed to.
The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 156: Page 66, line 15, strike out "\$7,588,300" and insert "\$16,-487,800."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 156, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,-620,550."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 160: Page 67, line 23, strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert the following: "and to remain available until advanced to the Colorado River Dam fund, \$3,327,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 160, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and to remain available until advanced to the Colorado River Dam fund, \$3,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 165: Page 68, line 17, strike out the word "available" and insert "to remain available until expended."

JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 165, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "to remain available until expended for carrying out projects (including the construction of transmission lines) previously or herein authorized by Congress.'

The motion was agreed to.
Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mis-

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 176: Page 70, line 12, strike out "June 30, 1946" and insert in lieu thereof the word "expended."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 176, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "June 30, 1947."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma tell us the reason for making that kind of change in this project. Was there any evidence before the conferees to indicate that the money would be expended by June 30, 1947?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say the committee changed the date in several places in the bill; we made the money available for 2 years at the suggestion of some of the conferees, and I might add, it seems to this committee to be a wise provision.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This is in harmony, then, with the principle that the committee has applied to all funds of this sort under the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There are several places in the bill wherein we thought it would be advantageous to have the funds remain available for 2 years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I presume that in this particular instance these funds will be exhausted before the date fixed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That of course is possible.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Generally speaking, they have to allocate these funds for specific programs and projects, and if the projects should not be completed, I would see no reason for holding up a small balance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The idea was that the Congress would have a chance to review them after a period of two years. We thought that by this 2year provision Congress will be able to hold a check on some of these projects.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagree-

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate No. 177: Page 20, line 13, insert: "Fort Peck project, Montana: For con-struction of transmission lines, substations, and other facilities as may be required by the Bureau of Reclamation, as authorized by the act of May 18, 1938 (16 U.S. C. 833), \$200,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 177, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Fort Peck project, Montana: For con-struction of transmission lines, substations, and other facilities as may be required by the Bureau of Reclamation, as authorized by the act of May 18, 1938 (16 U. S. C. 833), \$155,800, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1947."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 178½: Page 70, line 23, after "\$4,680,000", insert the words "to remain available until expended."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 178½, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ", to remain available until June 30, 1947."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Johnson].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 181: Page 71, line 19, strike out "June 30, 1946" and insert the word "expended."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "June 30, 1947."

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Dworshak].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I have not participated in the debate on the conference items contained in this appropriation bill for the Bureau of Reclamation, which will be completed with disposition of this particular item; however, in view of the fact that I have resided for the past 20 years on one of the most successful Federal reclamation projects in the West and, further, that I happen to be the only member of the subcommittee who comes from the arid western section of our country, I should like to allay the fears of some of my colleagues who have participated in this debate. Coming from the Western States, as I do, and having been profoundly interested in the reclamation development of our country, I can assure the Members of the House that this subcommittee has been diligent in the consideration of the program for reclamation development.

It was 43 years ago this month that the first reclamation act was passed by the Congress and throughout these four decades there has been just a little less than \$1,000,000,000 of Federal funds appropriated for this development program. Recently Secretary Ickes and Commissioner Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, appeared before the House Committee on Irrigation and outlined an extensive postwar reclamation program which will entail approximately \$5,000,000,000,000, or five times as much as has been appropriated for reclamation in the past 43 years.

May I say to the Members of the House from the Western States that there has been no hostility displayed at any time during the exhaustive hearings by the members of this committee who live in the middle western part of the country or in the East. There has been no disposition whatsoever to interfere with the Bureau of Reclamation. However, there has come a realization to the members of the committee-which I share-that it is no longer the sole responsibility of the Federal agency, the Bureau of Reclamation, to take over complete jurisdiction for the expenditure of these millions of dollars which are appropriated out of the Federal Treasury by the Congress.

As Members of this great lawmaking body we have a joint responsibility to cooperate and to reconcile the various suggestions and proposals and recommendations made by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other Federal agencies, because it is only in that way that we can force adherence to and compliance with the reclamation acts which have been enacted by Congress during the last 40 Under this program no interest is charged on the funds which are reimbursable in reclamation development by the water districts and they have approximately 40 years to make those repayments. You probably also know that the reimbursable portions of these projects charged to power revenue have 50 years within which to be repaid, with a provision for a 3-percent interest charge.

It seems to me that it is the responsibility of your subcommittee on Interior appropriations and the entire Congress to see that the Bureau of Reclamation follows the reclamation pattern which you have outlined. I have the highest regard for Commissioner Bashore and his associates—but this program is your responsibility and the responsibility of this subcommittee on appropriations.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? First for a question and then for an observation?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman believes, does he not, that the Bureau of Reclamation has done a splendid piece of work during the 43 years of its existence?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes. May I answer that by saying that is the reason I believe the subcommittee has a responsibility to see that reclamation is carried along in the postwar period without any tragic blunders; and it is only by retaining a check upon this executive power and giving the agency our cooperation in providing these funds that we can assure a continuation of the program which you are now commending.

Mr. MURDOCK. As a Member from the West and chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I want to join with the gentleman and others in checking carefully on this great agency in its work and at the same time support it fully in its necessary program. Now is the time for the exhibition of real statesmanship in the development of the West.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 258: Page 97, line 4, strike out "\$1,895,675" and insert "\$1,939,-000, including \$30,000 for the acquisition of the Ovington properties within the Olympic National Park."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rooney moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 258, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$1,925,-675, including \$30,000 for the acquisition of the Ovington properties within the Olympic National Park."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 264: Page 98, line 7, insert the following: "Lake Texoma Recreational Area, Texas and Oklahoma; For administration, protection, improvement, and maintenance in cooperation with the Chief of Engineers of the War Department of recreational areas devoted to recreational use within the Denison Dam and Reservoir projects, \$44,800."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rooney moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 264, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the last line of said amendment, strike out "\$44,800", and insert in lieu thereof "\$40,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 280: Page 104, line 13, strike out "\$262,750" and insert "\$543,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rooney moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 280, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$328,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 320: Page 120, line 8, insert the following:

"Sec. 10. Hereafter the Secretary may delegate to subordinates the power to authorize changes in official stations of officers and employees and the payment of expenses of travel and transportation of household goods in connection with such change of official stations."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 320, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 11. During the fiscal year 1946, the Secretary may delegate to the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries the power to authorize changes in official stations of offi-cers and employees and the payment of ex-penses of travel and transpotration of household goods in connection with such change of official stations,"

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) entitled "Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes."

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN POSTAL RATES

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same.

R. L. DOUGHTON, JERE COOPER, JOHN D. DINGELL, HAROLD KNUTSON, DANIEL A. REED.

Managers on the Part of the House. WALTER F. GEORGE, DAVID I. WALSH, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, ROBERT A. TAFT,

HUGH BUTLER, Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes, submit the following state-ment in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment corrects a technical error in section 222 of the Revenue Act of 1942, by which the provision in section 222 (c) for review by a special di-vision of the Tax Court of questions arising under section 721 (a) (2) (C) and section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code was made applicable only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941. The effect of the amendment is that the review provision will apply to all taxable years beginning after December

31, 1939. The House recedes.
Amendment No. 2: This amendment extends to June 30, 1946, the time in which plans adopted prior to January 1, 1945, may be adjusted to meet the requirements of paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 165 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code. These paragraphs deal with requirements as to coverage, contributions, and benefits and prohibited discriminations in favor of officers, stockholders, and highly paid and supervisory employees. The Senate recedes.

R. L. DOUGHTON, JERE COOPER, JOHN D. DINGELL, HAROLD KNUTSON, DANIEL A. REED. Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 65) to transfer to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the functions, powers, duties, and records of certain corporations.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky explain this legislation?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution which was reported out unanimously by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and passed unanimously by that body. It has been reported unanimously by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House. It provides for the dissolution of the Defense Plant Corporation, the Defense Supplies Corporation, the Metals Reserve Company, the Rubber Reserve Company, and the Disaster Loan Corporation.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation asks that this resolution be passed in order to effect certain economies and in order to secure the orderly dissolution and settlement of the affairs of these corporations.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It merely provides for the dissolution of a number of agencies?

Mr. SPENCE. That is correct. Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It provides for nothing else?

Mr. SPENCE. It provides for nothing else.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I congratulate the gentleman, and I hope he will continue the good work and bring in a few more resolutions of the same character.

Mr. SPENCE. I think it meets with the approval of everyone. It merely

transfers certain rights, duties, authority, and assets of these corporations to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the orderly dissolution of the corporations and the continuation of such functions as are required to be continued. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert the report of the banking and Currency Committee on the resolution:

The Committee on Banking and Currency to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) to transfer to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the functions, powers, duties, and records of certain corpora-tions, having considered the same, report fa-vorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the joint resolution do pass.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to provide for the dissolution of certain subsidiary corporations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and to provide for the transfer of their functions, powers, and duties to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The subsidiary corporations affected are the Defense Plant Corporation, the Metals Reserve Company, the Rubber Reserve Company, the Defense Supplies Corporation, and the Disaster Loan Corporation.

All of these subsidiary corporations, except the Disaster Loan Corporation, were created by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended. This section was amended by an act of June 25, 1940, so as to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, acting through subsidlary corporations to be created by it for such purposes, to build and operate plants and facilities for the manufacture of matériel, and to procure supplies equipment, etc., and to buy materials declared by the President to be strategic and critical. The act provided that activities under this authority should be undertaken at the request of the Federal Loan Administrator, and with the approval of the President. Pursuant to this authority, the Rubber Reserve Company and the Metals Reserve Company were created on June 28, 1940, primarily for the purpose of buying a stock pile of rubber, tin, and other materials. Later, the Rubber Reserve Company established and is now operating the synthetic-rubber program. The Defense Plant Corpo-ration was created on August 22, 1940, pri-marily to build and operate plants and facilities for the production of war matériel and to otherwise aid in the national defense. The Defense Supplies Corporation was created on August 29, 1940, to purchase and stock-pile strategic and critical materials other than rubber, mi_erals, and metals, and to do other things necessary to the production and procurement of essential materials.

Thus, it is apparent that the corporations dissolved by this resolution, with the exception of the Disaster Loan Corporation, were created to perform certain functions arising out of the present emergency. The function of these corporations has been substantially that of procurement of strategic and critical materials and other supplies and equipment essential to the successful prosecution of the This has for the most part been accomplished and, therefore, some administrative reorganization at this time is desirable. The transfer to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the functions, powers, duties, and authority of these corporations would simplify operations and it may reasonably be expected that some economy in operation can be effected.

This joint resolution will have the effect of vesting in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation such title and interests in property. both real and personal, of the designated corporations as such corporations have as of the effective date of the joint resolution, and of giving the Reconstruction Finance Corpora tion all rights and authority necessary to

convey such title and interests, or any part thereof, to the same extent as the designated corporations could have conveyed such title and interests had this joint resolution not been passed. Further, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as a result of the resolution will have all the powers, functions, authority, and duties vested in its subsidiary corporations under the Renegotiation Act, both as to contracts previously entered into by those subsidiaries and as to contracts which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation after July 1, 1945, may enter into under the authority transferred by the resolution. These, as well as other functions, powers, duties, and authority of the designated subsidiaries, whether conferred specifically by statute or otherwise, will, under the resolution, be vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation whose Board of Directors will act with respect thereto in the place of the board of directors of the subsidiaries.

The enactment of this resolution will not

result in any interference with the procurement of supplies necessary to the successful prosecution of the war against Japan. Management would remain where it is now, in the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the members of which at the present time are also directors of these subsidiary corporations. In addition all outstanding contracts and new contracts which may be necessary would be administered by substantially the same personnel as at the present time, although acting directly for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. These subsidiary corporations now utilize Reconstruction Finance Corporation personnel in performing their functions, having no employees of their own; consequently, the same personnel will be available to perform the functions transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, without the necessity of transferring such personnel.

While the Disaster Loan Corporation was created not for national-defense purposes, but to provide loans necessitated by floods or other catastrophes, nevertheless since it is managed by Reconstruction Finance Corporation officers and agents under rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, there is no sound basis for having these functions performed by a separate corporate entity.

The War Damage Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Mortgage Company, and the Federal National Mortgage Association, all subsidiaries of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, are not included in the resolution. The War Damage Corporation, while wholly owned and managed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was created for a highly specialized purpose, and it is believed that it should continue as a separate corporate entity until its insurance program directly related to the war has been completed. Undoubtedly it should and will at that time be liquidated. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation Mortgage Company was organized under the laws of Maryland, and while its capital stock is owned by and it is subject to the management of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, it is believed undesirable at this time to include within the resolution a Statechartered corporation.

The Federal National Mortgage Association was organized pursuant to the provisions of title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide a ready market for insured mortgages, and operates within the limitations and restrictions imposed by that act. Because of the nature of these restrictions it is considered inadvisable to include the Association in this resolution.

The U. S. Commercial Company and the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, although originally organized for national-defense purposes by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to the authority contained in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

Act, as amended, and Rubber Development Corporation, established for the purpose of procuring natural rubber from outside the United States, are not included in the resolution for the reason that they have been transferred to and are subject to the supervision of the Foreign Economic Administration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, nothwithstanding any other provision of law, all functions, powers, duties, and authority of the corporations hereinafter designated, are hereby transferred, together with all their documents, books of account, records, assets, and liabilities of every kind and nature, to Reconstruction Finance Corporation and shall be performed, exercised, and administered by that Corporation in the same manner and to the same extent and effect as if originally vested in Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the designated corporations are hereby dissolved: Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Rubber Reserve Company, and Defense Supplies Corporation, created by Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to the act of June 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 572), and Disaster Loan Corporation, created by the act of February 11, 1937 (50 Stat. 19), are hereby designated as the corporations to which this joint resolution

SEC. 2. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall assume and be subject to all liabilities, whether arising out of contract or otherwise, of the corporations dissolved by this joint resolution. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any of such corporations shall abate by reason of the enactment of this joint resolution, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after the date of such enactment, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a determination of the questions involved may allow the same to be maintained by or against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect on July 1, 1945.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. Murray of Tennessee) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MARCANTONIO) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a speech delivered by him.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in connection with my remarks the report of the committee on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate con-

sideration of the bill H. R. 511, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1137), is hereby amended by adding, immediately following section 304 thereof, a new section to be numbered 304A and reading as follows:

"Sec. 304A. An alien, if eligible to naturalization, 50 years of age or over, who has resided in the United States continuously since prior to July 1, 1924, and who, on or prior to the effective date of this section, has made a declaration of intention to become a citizen which is not more than 7 years old, or who, within 2 years from the effective date of this section, shall make a declaration of intention, may thereafter file petition for naturalization and be admitted to citizenship upon full and complete compliance with all requirements of the naturalization laws, except that he shall not be required to speak the English language, sign his declaration or petition in his own handwriting, or meet other educational requirements: Provided, That this section shall apply only to petitions for naturalization filed within 4 years after the date of the enactment of this act."

SEC. 2. Section 326 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1150; 8 U. S. C. 726), is hereby amended by adding a new subsection, to be known as subsection (e) and reading as follows:

"(e) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any allen whose son or daughter is a citizen of the United States and has served or is serving honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions. For the purpose of this section, the present war shall be deemed to have commenced on December 7, 1941, and to continue until the termination of all hostilities in the present war."

SEC. 3. The Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1137), is hereby amended by adding, immediately following section 331 thereof, a new section to be numbered 331A and reading as follows:

"SEC. 331A. A declaration of intention to become a citizen shall not be required of any alien whose son or daughter is a citizen of the United States and has served or is serving honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions. For the purpose of this section, the present war shall be deemed to have commenced on December 7, 1941, and to continue until the termination of all hostilities in the present war."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 511 is here with the approval of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. It contains three provisions. I do not think there is any particular objection to this bill, but I will explain it briefly.

The first section provides that aliens who have been in this country prior to July 1, 1944, and who are more than 50

years of age, and who otherwise comply with all the nationality laws, rules, and regulations, may file petitions for citizenship and waive the educational requirements now provided by law. That is to say, if a man were 50 years of age or more and he cannot sign his name, but is otherwise a good citizen, he may file his petition; and if the court sees fit, he may recommend him for citizenship and if approved be admitted to citizenship. He must comply with all requirements, however, as far as being a good citizen, length of residence, filing of declaration, and so on, is concerned. Only educational requirements are waived, and only to this particular group.

I do not know the exact number, but there are several men and women who have been here a great many years who are too old now to meet these requirements. I am informed by the Bureau of Naturalization that the average age is probably 65 years.

If there are any questions that affect this particular section, I will be very glad

to attempt to answer them.

The next section of the bill provides that in petitioning for citizenship aliens who come under what is technically known as the Alien Enemy Act, may file petitions for citizenship without the necessity of securing what is called a Presidential order, provided they have children, boys or girls who are serving or who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States. That is to say at the present time if an alien has filed a petition for citizenship prior to December 7, 1941, and his former country is at war with the United States, before he may be considered by a court, he must secure this Presidential order which waives the fact that he is technically an He may waive that order under this bill, provided he has a son or daughter now serving, or who has served, honorably in the armed forces.

He must, of course, comply with all rules and regulations with regard to period of residence, good character, loyalty to our Government, and so forth. Only the so-called Presidential order is waived

under this section.

The third provision is a further amendment to the Nationality Act which provides that an alien who desires to become a citizen of the United States may have the filing of a declaration of intention waived provided he has a son or daughter now serving or who has served honorably in the armed forces of the United States.

As a matter of fact, about 70 percent of those who file petitions at the present time have their declarations waived anyway, because they can do it if their spouse is a citizen of the United States. If having a spouse who is a citizen of the United States is ground for a waiver of declaration of intention, then this requirement would seem to be sufficient to waive the declaration. This section provides that if the petitioner has a son or daughter serving honorably in the armed forces of the United States, or who has so served, then he will not have to file a declaration. It does not waive any other provisions of the law. The petitioner must comply with all other requirements of the law as in other cases.

The court will have to pass on the petition the same as on the petition of any other applicant, except that this gives these petitioners the right to waive the declaration if they can show they have a son or daughter now serving or who has served honorably in the armed forces.

If there are any questions with respect to any of these provisions I will be glad to attempt to answer them.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman vield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield. Mr. MILLS. Was the bill reported unanimously by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not quite sure whether it was a unanimous report. There may have been one or two opposed to it. I am not sure. I do not want to make any mistake. I do know there was very little, if any objection to this meas-

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. Does the Department of Justice approve these three amendments?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, sir. The Department of Justice approves this bill as it is.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HULL. Is section 2 broad enough to include alien Jans?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It does not include the Japs; not at all; absolutely not. Mr. HULL. Not under any circum-

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not under any condition or circumstance.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. MARCANTONIO. will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

stance?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the committee for having reported out this legislation. It benefits really the parents of men and women in our armed services.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the purpose of the last two sections of the bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illi-

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration, H. R. 511, is my bill. It was introduced by me as a result of 30 years' experience as a superintendent of schools in a small city, Oglesby, Ill., an industrial city with a mixed population composed of 17 different European nationalities. The problem of Americanization naturally was a vital problem, a pressing problem, confronting

schools and the community. In trying to solve that problem we organized nightschool classes for adult aliens to try to help them meet the educational requirements of our naturalization laws.

Because I was personally interested in this problem and in these hard-working, earnest aliens, who had come to America with their families seeking a place where their children at least might have opportunities that were out of the question in their native countries, I taught some of these night classes myself so that I could observe at first hand the effect of the work we were offering to these adult pupils. On many occasions these men, 40 and 45 years old, after working hard all day in the cement mills-and a day's work then was a 10- and 12-hour shiftwould fall asleep over their work. Utterly worn out with the day's work they were in no condition to do mental work As a result many became discouraged and dropped out of the night classes.

As superintendent of schools, I noticed how eager these foreign parents were for their children to acquire an education; how cooperative they were with the schools in seeing to it that their children attended regularly; and what sacrifices they were willing to make in order that their boys and girls might go through high school. It is because of this first-hand experience with these worthy people that I feel very strongly that the educational requirements of our naturalization laws should be removed, at least for these elderly aliens, most of whom are past 60 years of age—too old to learn to read and write English acceptably. Therefore, I introduced H. R. 511.

I believe in the educational requirements of our naturalization laws. think they should be retained and enforced in connection with all aliens applying for citizenship, if those aliens are under 50 years of age. They should be required to make a real effort to qualify themselves for citizenship. But for these old people-most of whom have been here for over 30 years, who have worked hard, bought a home, paid taxes, sent their children through school, and are respected residents of the communities they have helped to build-I, for one, feel that if they can meet all other requirements for citizenship, we should, in their case, waive the educational requirements of our naturalization laws.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is needed more now than ever before. It would take care of the forgotten people who came to this great America in the 1890's, young, honest, industrious people who never really had the time or the opportunity to learn how to read and write. They married, had large families, and have given their best years in honest labor. Many are property owners and taxpayers. Many had sons and daughters who served our great country in World War I and are today giving their lives in the great battle in which we are now engaged for the preservation of our free institutions. sons and daughters of others are today in the vanguard of America's progress. Yet, these same clean-living people of America cannot become citizens unless they pass an examination that would

probably flunk a high-school graduate or perhaps a college graduate. If the only requirements for citizenship were contributions to national wealth through honest labor and love for democracy, almost all of our noncitizens could easily become citizens.

There are thousands of people in the United States who have made application for their first and second papers, but who failed to pass the examination. In making application they renounced allegiance to their native countries, and yet they are not citizens of the United States. They love America, they belong to America, they are willing to fight to defend America and keep it democratic and free, so why deny them citizenship? What is needed as well as tanks and planes is a united people. I wish to state that I am heartily in favor of this legislation which would give relief from stringent naturalization laws and would encourage naturalization.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the bill will be read a third time and

passed.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

unanimous consent, a similar By House bill (H. Res. 227) was laid on the

THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes

the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 937, an act to amend the act suspending until June 30, 1945, the running of the statute of limitations applicable to violations of the antitrust laws, so as to continue such suspension until June 30, 1946, and pass the bill. I make this request by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk

read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to suspend until June 30, 1945, the running of the statute of limitations applicable to violations of the antitrust laws," approved October 10, 1942 (56 Stat. 781; U. S. C., Supp. III, title 15, note following sec. 16), is amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1945" where it appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1946."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NO. 1

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 215 authorizing the production of petroleum for the national defense from Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Georgia explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I appeared before the Rules Committee this morning

by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs and was advised by the chairman and other members of the Rules Committee that a rule was granted to make in order House Joint Resolution 215. Instead of calling up the rule to bring the matter before the House I am asking unanimous consent because there is no controversy on the subject matter of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution repeals the resolution passed last year as Public Law 344, approved June 17, 1944.

The resolution of last year provided that during the 18-month period from and after June 1, 1944, the Secretary of the Navy could develop and operate Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 to permit a daily rate of production of 65,000 barrels but not in excess of that rate, with a further restriction that not more than 30,000,000 barrels of oil could be drawn from this reserve during this 18-month period.

With the limitation of 65,000 barrels per day it resulted that an average of something in the neighborhood of only 62,500 barrels could be produced per day, as under no circumstances could the 65,000 barrels per day be exceeded.

The resolution now under consideration does three things: First, it permits an average of 65,000 barrels to be produced, averaged over each calendar month; second, it extends the period over which oil can be withdrawn to December 31, 1946, or a period of 13 additional months; and third, it permits the withdrawal of, in round numbers, 26,000,000 barrels of oil during this 13-month period.

This House Joint Resolution 215 is necessary at this time in order to provide the full 65,000 barrels per day to get the oil that the Joint Chiefs of Staff need for the prosecution of the war, and also so that the Navy can go ahead with making the necessary plans for withdrawing this additional oil from the

Under existing law they cannot average the 65,000 barrels every day. The actual production is running around 62,000 barrels. What we propose to do is to permit the Navy to draw the oil necessary, during a calendar month, to average 65,000 barrels a day.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Naval Affairs is deeply concerned with the preservation of the oil in the ground and we have been fighting for years to hold it, but the national emergency is of such character that the joint Chiefs of Staff have advised that in the prosecution of the war in the Pacific it is absolutely essential that we continue to draw from our Naval Reserve No. 1 the oil authorized in this resolution based upon an average of 65,000 barrels per day for a period to December 31, 1946.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. course, I can understand the reason for making it a monthly average, and I am also ready to follow the advice of the joint Chiefs of Staff so far as the length of time it is necessary to draw oil out of the reserve. But why is it necessary to repeal the whole measure that the gentleman's committee previously brought

Mr. VINSON. We are not repealing the whole measure, I may say to the gentleman from California; we merely repealing the joint resolution which Congress authorized. We are merely repealing that which we permitted them to draw at the rate of 65,000 barrels but not to exceed that rate for any one day for 18 months from June 1, 1944, and the time limit.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I see if I can get it clear. As I recall it. we passed two different measures.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The first of which was a measure laying down the methods and the restrictions that would have to be included in any agreement which might be entered into.

Mr. VINSON. Now, we are not repeal-

ing that part of it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is what I want to know. What you are repealing is the second resolution which the gentleman's committee brought in stating, as I recall it, that production could be at the rate of 65,000 barrels a day?

Mr. VINSON. That is all.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And that would extend until December 1?

Mr. VINSON. That is all. We are not repealing the basic law upon which the contract was entered into. We are merely repealing that permission that was set forth in the joint resolution. You must have a joint resolution to carry out the basic law.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But this only affects the length of time?

Mr. VINSON. That is right; and it permits an average of 65,000 barrels to be withdrawn daily.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And it makes a slight adjustment in the amount of oil that can be produced?

Mr. VINSON. It means that 26,000,000 barrels of oil can be taken out of the ground during this 13-month period.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman mean 26,000,000?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the act of June 4, 1920. amended (41 Stat. 813; 52 Stat. 1252; 58 Stat. 280), directs the Secretary of the Navy, among other things, to use and operate all properties within the naval petroleum reserves as are or may become subject to the control and use by the United States for naval purposes for the production of petroleum whenever and to the extent the Secretary, with the approval of the President, finds required for national defense: Provided, however, That no petroleum shall be produced pursuant to such a finding unless authorized by the Congress by joint resolution; and

Whereas such a finding of the necessity for such production to the extent authorized herein has been so made and approved:

Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the production of petroleum (including crude oil and associated gas and other hydrocarbons) from Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 is hereby authorized at a rate not in excess of 65,000 barrels of crude oil produced and saved per day, averaged over each calendar month beginning with and including the month in which this joint resolution shall be approved by the President, such production (to the extent in excess of that otherwise authorized by the act above cited) not to extend beyond December 31, 1946; and that the joint resolution approved June 17, 1944 (Public Law 344, 78th Cong., 2d sess, 58 Stat. 283), is hereby repealed: Provided, That such repeal shall not operate to affect existing contracts relating to the production of petroleum nor the availability of funds from the appropriation "Naval emergency fund" for carrying out such contracts.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. Arends) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 129] Anderson. Hall, Ploeser Edwin Arthur Plumley N. Mex. Barden Hall, Powell Barry Leonard W. Powers Rains Bell Hand Bender Rayfiel Rich Hart Bloom Bradley, Mich. Hartley Hays Hébert Riley Rizley Buckley Buffett Heffernan Rodgers, Pa. Roe, N. Y. Sasscer Bunker Hobbs Burgin Butler Holifield Shafer Cannon, Mo. Case, S. Dak. Sheppard Hope Jarman Johnson, Ind. Sikes Celler Simpson, Pa Chiperfield Smith, Ohio Smith, Va. Somers, N. Y. Clason Combs Judd Kearney Cooley Kee Stigler Sumner, Ill. Kilburn Crawford Dawson LaFollette Taber Dickstein Lane Taylor Doughton, N. C. Lanham Thom Lea Lesinski Link Thomas, Tex. Vursell Earthman Eaton Elsaesser Walter Fenton Flannagan Lynch McGlinchey White Whitten Fogarty Folger Fuller Martin, Iowa Wickersham Merrow Wilson Winter Geelan Granger O'Neal Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 326 Members have answered to their names.

Phillips

Grant, Ind.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE RE-PORT ON LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3199) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security

Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a telegram.

Mr. CROSSER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer on June 3 in regard to a speech by former Postmaster General James A. Farley.

READJUSTING RATES OF POSTAGE ON CATALOGS, ETC.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 292 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3238) readjusting the rates of postage on catalogs and similar printed advertising and other matter of fourth-class mail, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, when adopted, makes in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3238) which is a bill to increase the postage on catalogs I understand about 20 percent. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, after which it will read under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Allen].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I desire.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H. R. 3238, a bill readjusting the rates of postage on catalogs and similar printed advertising and other matter of fourthclass mail. For some reason which many do not understand this bill is before us. The Committee on Post Office and Post Roads has hurriedly passed it out of the committee. Yes, brought it out in a piecemeal way instead of correctly and thoroughly going into the entire mail rates of all classes of mail. By taking this course they have us all in confusion. It is my hope that this bill not pass, that it go back to the committee and that the committee have further hearings taking up all classes of mail with the expectation of properly adjusting all classes.

Much will be said about this class of mail being carried at a loss. As a whole, our Post Office Department is running at a profit. I do not think anyone will contradict me when I state that it is not contemplated that our Post Office Department be a profit-making institution. It was originally inaugurated to give the people of our country a service. If this bill passes the Post Office Department will make an even greater profit. Such a course is not any more justifiable than if we attempted to run all our governmental agencies and departments at a profit. That would mean to run the Rural Electrification, the Bureau of Mines, the agriculture service, our Federal courts at a profit and I am certain that none of us want that.

If this bill becomes a law an attempt will be made to make a profit out of mailing service for newspapers, libraries, and schools who are now through the proper theory of enlightenment and educational purposes obtaining a service which is running at a loss.

So in conclusion I would submit that there is not any need or justification for a further profit to an agency intended to give our people a service, not a revenue producing department.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am opposed to this rule and to the bill. I opposed the rule in the Committee on Rules because I believe that all legislation pertaining to postal rates should be considered at the same time, thus giving an opportunity to the Members of the House to get an over-all picture of the postal rate structure.

I am especially opposed to this measure because it does increase the postage on the fourth-class mail for catalogs and for advertising literature, not in the first zone or in the large city areas where such literature may be printed, but rather in the far-distant zones, the rural areas, as it were. This will work to the disadvantage of the individuals who live out on This will work to the disadvanthe farms or in the States far distant from the great centers of population. Either they will not be able to receive this advertising literature and material or it will cost more to send it to them, and the cost to the concern doing business in such areas will be considerably increased. I am opposed to the bill. because I do not believe this is the time. right now, when we are ready to enter into the reconversion period, to place any greater handicap or any greater cost upon business. Within the next few months, and certainly within the next year or so, there is going to be an expansion of business throughout the country as the result of reconversion to peacetime production. There will be all sorts of new enterprises started; small enterprises, if you please, which will be dependent upon this type of advertising. It will certainly place a handicap upon all business.

I might add that in my opinion the postal-rates structure was not set up to be profit-making. As an over-all matter the Post Office Department of the Government does make a profit. This will not reduce the rates materially on some classe of mail, but will simply increase, as I understand, the cost of the transportation of this class of mail to the users thereof. This is but the first step.

I want the House to understand. There are other bills to come in, which will follow this bill, that will increase the postal rates all along the way, and in all classifications, and in the end the Post Office Department will be converted into a gigantic profit-making institution. Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker,

will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the

gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. May I call the gentleman's attention to the schedule on page 2 of the report?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I have

seen that schedule.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Therein, the gentleman will see that the postal rates are reduced on long-haul packages of more than 2 pounds.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. On some weights it is reduced, but many of the rates are increased by 1 cent.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I mean pack-

ages of 2 pounds or more.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; but most of this mail comes under the 1-pound provision. As the gentleman well knows, the entire purpose behind this bill is to increase the total income of the Post Office Department from this class of mail.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. To make this class of mail stand on its own bottom, and thereby enable us to reduce the post-

age on first-class mail.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But the gentle-man knows as well as I that the postage rates will not be reduced on first-class mail, except for local delivery, which means practically nothing. The gentleman also knows that the over-all effect of this bill is to increase revenues.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. On fourth-

class mail only.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. On this class of mail, so that the gentleman's interjection that it actually reduces it was not correct.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the

gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. As a matter of fact, this is just another method of increasing taxes and imposing them on a particular group of people.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly. Let me say to the gentleman that this is just another imposition of increased governmental cost on business.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker. I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Someone has said that this places a slight burden on the Treasury. That perhaps could be argued if it were not for the fact the Post Office Department as a whole makes a profit. But I want to remind you again the cost of this Government is being borne by business and by the people who receive these communications, so that it is just as broad as it is long.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gen-

tleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the

gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. May I ask the gentleman if he voted for the bill increasing the compensation of postal employees which was passed by the House recently?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, and as I understand, the gentleman from Virginia also voted for it. I also understand that the present postal rates will permit the payment of those salaries contained in the new schedule of pay.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is misin-

formed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I am misinformed, I certainly have been misinformed by the members of the gentleman's committee, because that was the understanding given to me as a member of the Committee on Rules, when the pay increase measure came before us.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. As in the case of all other taxes, if this bill is passed the increase will ultimately be passed on to the consuming public.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It will mean an increase to the consuming public, or they will have to do without the service heretofore furnished to the people.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield further. I was interested in what the gentleman said that this might be followed by other bills making increases on other pieces of postal matter.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from Tennessee can rest assured there is no "might" about it. It is certain, I think, that this bill will be followed by a number of other measures from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads for the purpose of increasing postal rates in different classifications; in fact, the members of that committee have so informed the Members of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I understand this bill originally included books and would have carried an increase on books. But that has been eliminated and will be included in one of the other bills to which the gentleman refers. I hope, however, it will not come before the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There is another bill pending in the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, which I am sure will be brought to the floor of the House if this bill is enacted, which will increase the rate on books.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I hope that

will not be the case.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield another minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, to further answer the gentleman from Tennessee, I, too, hope that the legislation to increase the postal rates on books will not be brought before the House. But I do believe, if this measure which is now before us is enacted, it will undoubtedly be followed by legislation to increase the postal rates on books.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. The gentleman does not think some of them are in favor of placing a tax upon learning, does he?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, a little learning would not hurt now and then.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. May I state to the gentleman that I am also opposed to this legislation. Was there any agreement when they voted for the postal increase that it would be followed by this particular legislation?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. PATRICK. Would that not be a reason, if that is the way this legislation is carried on, why it should not be referred to the committee and all kindred legislation be brought out for consideration at one time?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is my opinion that all of it should be considered at the same time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Church].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that the distribution of catalogs increases the postal revenue from firstclass mail. Catalogs should not be penalized. This bill does just that.

I have really asked for this time in order to read into the RECORD this release:

Postmaster General Frank C. Walker last night sent to the Treasury Department a check for \$51,102,579-the largest single payment to the Treasury for postal surpluses he has made.

The check brought to the \$150,000,000 mark payments from surpluses for the fiscal year which will end on Saturday, June 30, when Mr. Walker retires as Postmaster General.

For the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1943, the Post Office Department had a surplus of \$1,334,551. This was the first surplus in 24 years. It was followed by a \$37,768,028 surplus in 1944.

The sums with which the postal service was dealing became so large that Mr. Walker, during the present fiscal year, inaugurated the practice of paying surpluses into the Treasury at the end of each quarter.

The check mailed yesterday brought to \$189,102,579 payments to the Treasury from postal surpluses during the time that Mr. Walker has served as Postmaster General.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGregor].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly opposed to House Resolution 292, which makes in order the consideration of H. R. 3238.

May I say I think it is unfair for any committee of this Congress to bring in such a bill as this without giving us an opportunity to review the hearings. have just returned from the Clerk's desk and I find that the hearings have not been printed or at least they are not at the Clerk's desk and available to the Members. Yet we are asked to vote this afternoon for a new tax, because, Mr. Speaker, this is a new tax on the people of the United States. If we are going to have a new tax let us have the intestinal fortitude to come out with a bill and say that it is a new tax rather than to come out with this form of legislation. Personally I am for reduction in taxesadditional taxes

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.
Mr. GALLAGHER. This bill affects
just one class of mail, the big mail-order business

Mr. McGREGOR. I hate to disagree with the gentleman but I most assuredly disagree with him on this particular issue and I am sure that if he will carefully analyze and study the bill he will agree with me that this legislation affects thousands of small business people and really a new tax that will have to be paid by millions of people of this country.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speak-er, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Mason) there

were—ayes 85, noes 80.
Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors. the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were-yeas 194, nays 142, not voting 97. as follows:

[Roll No. 1301 YEAS-194

Abernethy Dworshak Allen, La. Eberharter Andrews, Ala. Barrett, Pa. Elliott Link Engle, Calif. Bates, Ky. Bates, Mass. Beckworth Ervin Feighan Fernandez Bennet, N. Y. Fisher Biemiller Flannagan Bland Flood Bonner Boren Fogarty Forand Boykin Bradley, Pa. Brehm Gallagher Gamble Gardner Brooks Brown, Ga. Gary Gathings Buck Geelan Bulwinkle Gibson Gordon Burch Burgin Byrne, N. Y. Camp Cannon, Mo. Granahan Grant, Ala. Carnahan Green Gregory Chapman Hagen Hancock Chelf Clark Hare Clements Cochran Coffee Cole, Mo. Cooper Corbett Harris Havenner Healy Hedrick Heselton Hoch Courtney Hope Huber Cravens Izac Jackson Crosser Crosser
Curley
Daughton, Va.
De Lacy
Delaney,
James J.
Delaney,
John J.
Dolliver Jennings Johnson, Luther A. Lyndon B. Jones Kean Dolliver Kee
Domengeaux Kelley, Pa
Doughton, N. C. Kelly, Ill.
Douglas, Calif. Kerr Kee Kelley, Pa. Resa Douglas, Ill. King Kirwan Doyle Rivers Robertson, Va. Robinson, Utah Larcade

LeFevre Lemke Lyle McCormack McCormack McDonough McGehee McKenzie McMillan, S. C. McMillen, Ill. Madden Maloney Manasco Mansfield, Mont. Mansfield, Tex. Marcantonio Mason Michener Miller, Calif. Mills Monroney Morgan Murdock Murphy Murray, Tenn. Neelv Norrell Norton O'Brien, Ill. O'Brien, Mich. O'Neal Pace Patman Patterson Peterson, Fla. Peterson, Ga. Philbin Pickett. Poage Price, Fla. Price Ill. Priest Quinn, N. Y. Rabaut Rabin Ramspeck Randolph Rankin Richards

Roe, Md. Rogers, Fla. Rogers, N. Y. Rooney Rowan Ryter Sadowski Savage Slaughter Snyder Sparkman Spence Starkey

Stevenson Stewart Sullivan Sumners, Tex. Sundstrom Tarver Thomas, Tex. Torrens Traynor Vinson Voorhis, Calif. Vorys, Ohio NAYS-142

Woodhouse Woodrum, Va. Zimmerman

Wadsworth

Whittington

Wickersham

Winstead

Wood

Mott Mundt

O'Hara O'Konski

Outland Patrick

Phillips

Powers

Ramey

Pittenger

Reece, Tenn. Reed, Ill.

Reed, N. Y. Rees, Kans.

Rizley Robertson,

Rockwell

Shafer

Short

Sheridan

Springer

Stockman

Stefan

Taber

Talbot Talle

Trimble

Vursell Weichel

Simpson, III. Smith, Maine Smith, Wis.

Thomas, N. J. Tibbott

Welch Wigglesworth Wolcott

Wolfenden, Pa

Wolverton, N. J. Woodruff, Mich.

N. Dak. Robsion, Ky.

Rockwell Rogers, Mass. Schwabe, Mo. Schwabe, Okla. Scrivner

Murray, Wis.

Weaver Weiss

Gillie Allen, Ill. Goodwin Andersen, H. Carl Graham Anderson, Calif. Griffiths Andresen. Gross August H. Andrews, N. Y. Gwinn, N. Y. Gwynne, Iowa Hale Halleck Harless, Ariz. Harness, Ind. Angell Arends Arnold Arnold Auchincloss Baldwin, N. Y. Barrett, Wyo. Beall Hendricks Henry Bennett, Mo. Hess Bishop Blackney Hill Hinshaw Hoeven Hoffman Bolton Brown, Ohio Bryson Buffett Byrnes, Wis. Campbell Canfield Horan Howell Hull Jenkins Case, S. Dak. Chenoweth Church Clevenger Cole, Kans Cunningham Jonkman Curtis

Holmes, Mass. Holmes, Wash. Jensen Johnson, Calif. Johnson, Ill. Johnson, Okla. Keefe Kefauver D'Alesandro Keigh Kilday Kinzer Knutson Dirksen Dondero

Ellis Ellsworth Elston Kunkel Landis Engel Mich. Latham Fallon LeCompte Fellows Lewis Luce Ludlow McConnell McCowen Fenton Fulton Gavin Gearhart Gerlach McGregor Gifford Gillespie Mahon Martin, Mass. Gillette Miller, Nebr.

NOT VOTING-97

Adams Gore Ploeser Plumley Anderson. Granger N. Mex. Bailey Grant, Ind. Hall, Powell Rains Edwin Arthur Rayfiel all, Rich Baldwin, Md. Barden Hall, Leonard W. Barry Riley Rodgers, Pa. Roe, N. Y. Russell Sabath Bell Hand Bender Hart Bloom Bradley, Mich. Brumbaugh Buckley Hartley Hays Hébert Heffernan Sharp Sheppard Sikes Simpson, Pa. Bunker Hobbs Holifield Butler Cannon, Fla. Hook Smith, Ohio Smith, Va. Carlson Jarman Celler Johnson, Ind. Chiperfield Somers, N. Y. Judd Clason Cole, N. Y. Kearney Sumner, 'Ill. Kilburn Colmer Kopplemann Taylor Combs LaFollette Thom Cooley Lane Tolan Lanham Crawford Walter Davis Lesinski Dawson Dickstein Lynch McGlinchey Wasielewski White Dingell Martin, Iowa Whitten Earthman May Wilson Eaton Merrow Morrison Winter

Fuller So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

O'Toole

Folger

On this vote:

Mr. Tolan for, with Mr. Kilburn against. Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Hook against.
Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Brumbaugh

Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Kopplemann against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Butler. Mr. Lane with Miss Sumner of Illinois.

Mr. Russell with Mr. Adams.

Mr. Stigler with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Plumley, Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Wilson. Mr. Bailey with Mr. Taylor, Mr. Davis with Mr. Winter. Mr. Morrison with Mr. Simpson of Pennsyl-

vania

Mr. Worley with Mr. Hartley. Mr. May with Mr. Smith of Ohio. Mr. Folger with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. D'Alesandro changed his yote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. Fallon changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3238) readjusting the rates of postage on catalogs and similar printed advertising and other matter of fourthclass mail, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3238 with Mr. CLARK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Burch] is recognized. Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3238, to readjust the rates of postage on catalogs and similar printed advertising and commercial mail matter, has been carefully considered and favorably reported by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, after extensive public hearings. The committee had before it the recommendations of the Post Office Department, which made a thorough and detailed study of such rates over a considerable period of time.

The bill applies to catalogs and other similar advertising matter as one type of mail, and to directories, lists, tariff schedules, industrial manuals, and other bound volumes, similar in character, as another type. Both types, however, are treated jointly since they do not differ materially, and both belong to the fourth-class mail matter. The handling of such types of mail is a service to The handling patrons engaged in business for profit and a need for a revision of the rate structure is apparent.

Public Law 566, approved May 29, 1928, contemplated and provided that all fourth-class mail should produce revenue in keeping with the cost of handling. The general relationship between total costs incurred and total revenues derived should be the primary consideration. It is proper that those who use the mails for transportation of this purely business type of mail should pay postage rates that cover the cost of the service rendered to them. The annual recurring deficits not only show that the mandate of the Congress is not being complied with but that an unwarranted subsidy is being granted to the users of this type of mail service.

This bill proposes a schedule which will increase rates on certain weights and hauls and decrease rates for other weights and hauls of catalogs and advertising matter, and decrease the rates generally for the remaining types of mail covered. A comparison of existing rates with those proposed is found on page 2 of House Report No. 648, which accompanies the bill. More than 99 percent of catalogs weigh 5 pounds or less and the average haul for catalogs is about 175 miles. For poundages from 1 to 5 mailed to the several zones the bill provides increases in some instances ranging from one-half cent to 3 cents and decreases in other instances ranging from 1 cent to

Based on substantially the same volume of mail handled during the year ended March 31, 1944, the new rates proposed by this bill are estimated to produce additional revenue of approximately \$886,000, over existing rates. At the same time, the temporary rate increases provided by the Revenue Act of 1943 will be repealed when the permanent schedule of rates proposed is made effective.

In connection with the proposed schedule there have been developed computed costs by weight of parcel, for each zone. This computation aims to spread the total costs incurred over the entire field of this mail business in accordance with a carefully developed formula, which gives recognition to a piece cost, a pound cost, and a pound-mile cost for each parcel.

To summarize briefly—this bill has three principal objectives:

First. To provide revenue in an amount sufficient to absorb the present deficit and place this part of the postal service on a self-sustaining basis.

Second. To enlarge the policy of fixing rates on fourth-class mail matter so as to apply them not only on the assumption that they are designed to promote the service to the public but that the revenue derived be commensurate with cost of handling.

Third. To discontinue the unwarranted subsidy in the transportation, handling, and delivery of purely commercial mail.

Mr. Chairman, in brief, this bill only increases the postage on catalogs. Catalogs are sent out by mail-order houses, advertising their wares; sent out advertising their wares, sent out in competition with the merchants scattered all over the country, the smaller merchants

and the independent merchants, and those merchants cannot understand why this Congress should sit here and subsidize the big mail order houses to their detriment and why they should be required to pay taxes to meet those subsidies.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may take.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, briefly stated, the question that is brought before this House by H. R. 3238 is simply this: Do we want to subsidize the mail-order houses of the Nation to the tune of a million dollars a year at the expense of the taxpayers of the Nation? That is exactly the proposition that is before this House.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. No; I do not yield at this time. The opposition has had their field day on the rule. This is the time really to get down to brass tacks and to discuss the real problem that is before the House.

I have before stated the question: Do we want to subsidize the mail-order houses at the expense of the taxpayer to the tune of a million dollars a year? That is the question before the House that this bill presents to us.

As we all know, this side of the aisle has been, all through the years since I have been in Congress, supposedly opposed to subsidies.

posed to subsidies.
Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Not at this time.

I was rather surprised that the bulk of the Members on this side of the aisle in voting on this rule voted "No." They do not even want to consider the question of subsidies in connection with the catalog houses of the Nation. I was rather amazed and surprised because that shows that some of my colleagues are very inconsistent in their attitudes. Personally, I feel that I must be consistent. I have always opposed subsidies, and I am opposing subsidies in this particular question that is before us, that is the problem and there is no getting around it. They say this increase in the postal rate on catalogs is a tax, another tax, an increased tax. I believe you gentlemen know this deficit has got to be made up from somewhere and that it is being made up in taxes. This is not an increased tax, but it is a tax upon those who are getting the benefit of the postal service and removing that much at least from those who are paying taxes to make up all Government deficits. Now, that is a simple statement of the whole matter.

Now, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I was just going to remark in addition to what the gentleman said a moment ago with reference to the adavntage to the large publishing houses, that it is to the disadvantage of the small business people.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. No; the gentleman had his field day before.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman does not like to have the facts brought out. Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to the gentleman from Ohio. The gentleman from Ohio did not yield to me when he was having his field day on the rule.

Now, Mr. Chairman, seriously speaking, this Congress in 1928 passed a law which makes it mandatory upon the Post Office Department to see to it that all fourth-class mail pays its way. That law has been ignored all through these years, and the Post Office Committee in connection with the Post Office Department is at least making an attempt to live up to the mandate this Congress placed upon the Postal Department way back in 1928. This is just one of the steps to see to it that they do live up to the mandate.

I have heard that we should bring this matter of postal rates before the House all at one time. There is no mandate as to making either second- or third-class mail pay its way; that is entirely at the discretion of the Congress; they can do that or they do not need to do that; but since this law is on the books requiring that all fourth-class mail pay its way then it seems to me there is nothing left for us to do but to see to it that all subsidies on the different types of fourth-class mail are removed.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Roe].

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I think this proposition has been put very plainly and simply before you and I am going to try to approach the subject from a slightly different angle.

The Post Office Department advises your committee that it costs roughly \$5,-000,000 to handle the catalogs that go through the Post Office Department, that they receive for handling those catalogs \$4,000,000; in other words, the catalogs of the country are being handled by the Post Office Department at a loss of \$1,000,000, or, to look at it in another way, the catalog people are paying 80 percent for handling the catalogs and the general public is paying the other 20 percent.

Why the taxpayers and why the businessmen of this country should pay 20 percent of the costs of handling the catalogs of the catalog houses is beyond my understanding. The proposition is very simple and, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] said, we are just carrying out the law.

We have already passed a parcel post law that has been adopted by the House and we are trying to see that all of these different classes of mail in the fourthclass department are put on a self-sustaining pay-as-you-go basis which is certainly sound for the Congress and the Nation to do.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen on the other side of the aisle made the statement that the committee should bring in one bill. That suggestion was also made before our committee. But we are trying to approach this matter in a sane, sensible businesslike manner. We are holding hearings on every proposition. We have given everybody a chance to be heard and after we have heard those in favor and those opposed, we tried to bring in a balanced program.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore hope the bill will be passed by a large majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the

gentleman has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGregor].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill for a number of reasons, but first I want to bring to your attention the statement of the chairman of the committee in which he said that extensive hearings have been held on this bill. I asked each and every Member of this body to go to the Clerk's desk and see if he can get a copy of these hearings. They are not available for our consideration.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gen-

tleman from Virginia.

Mr. BURCH. May I say to the gentleman that the hearings were promptly printed and if the gentleman had gone to the document room he could have obtained a copy of the hearings. We do not circulate the hearings to every Member of Congress. If the gentleman had asked at the document room he could have received one. We sent them to each member of the committee, and that is as far as any committee goes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Now, the distinguished chairman should know better than that; never can you find committee hearings in the document room.

Is it not true that the hearings are not available at the Clerk's desk for the Members of Congress?

Mr. BURCH. That is up to the officials here, not up to the committee.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman does not deny that the hearings are not available where we can get them and study them, in order that we might learn just what consideration was given to this

Mr. BURCH. Yes; they are where you can get them. You can get them from the document room.

Mr. McGREGOR. I take the position that the hearings are not available to us. And they are not in the document room. I ask the chairman to check, and he will see that he is in error.

Mr. BURCH. May I say that the chairman of the committee is not responsible for the hearings after they are distributed.

Mr. McGREGOR. They have not been distributed, but I am not criticizing the chairman of the committee, and I do not think he should criticize me for raising the point that the committee hearings on this bill are not available and insisting they should be made available to the membership when a bill is brought up for consideration.

The argument has been presented here that each one of the separate departments of the Post Office Department should be self-sustaining. Let me ask those Members who are putting forth that argument, are they willing to increase the rates on newspapers? Let them bring in a bill on newspapers; then we will know whether or not they are in favor of the various departments paying their own way.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. One thing at a time. We are going to have hearings on the first, second, and third covering newspapers, and there will be a bill brought in to change the rates on newspapers.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is the very thing I want to bring out. This bill is simply sticking the camel's nose under the tent. You are going to continue to bring on legislation which is an indirect tax on the people. Has not the time come when we should consider a reduction of taxes instead of an increase in taxes? Who pays postage—the people, of course-and is it not time we reduce the taxes of our people instead of increasing them?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I advise the gentleman that I have conferred with the Clerk of the House and I am informed that the reports he mentioned are not in the document room and are not available.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

There seems to be a move-or a drive by some Members of Congress to put additional taxes on our people. I venture to say before many months this Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads will bring out other bills that will increase the rates on other postal items. This bill is just a starter—a trial balloon-if you please. Let us defeat this measure and give warning that we do not favor increased taxes but favor a policy of a reduction of expenditures which will mean a reduction of taxes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. McGREGOR. May I say to you that this is going to affect every small business in the United States. Let us analyze it. Do you think the big mail order houses are going to absorb this tax? No. They are going to put it on the cost of their products, and every individual in the United States, all of us, are going to pay this tax. What is the result then? We are simply taxing our people more and more every day and putting more money into our Federal

Again I say, Mr. Chairman, I think it is time that we call a halt to the increased tax program and give consideration to a program that means reduction in taxes.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the whole crux of this situation is whether or not Congress is going to continue to subsidize the large mailorder houses at the expense of the little local independent businessman in the carriage of catalogs through the mail. It is an undisputed fact that for years the Post Office Department has been carrying and delivering catalogs for the large mail-order houses at a loss of a million dollars or more per year. Is it

fair to continue to subsidize these large mail-order houses in the carriage of their catalogs through the mails?

Here is what happens to your catalogs that go through the mails. These large mail-order houses send their catalogs by freight or by truck to the various centers of the United States and there deposit them in the post offices for local delivery, on rural routes, or for delivery within zones 1 and 2. They do not send their catalogs more than 175 miles through the mails because of the cost. If this bill is adopted it will only mean a cost of about 2 cents on every catalog. Catalogs are the advertising media of the mail-order houses. No mail-order house can exist today without catalogs. Why in the world should the Post Office Department be called upon to continue to subsidize these large mail-order houses? It is not fair to the local businessman for the Post Office Department to pay a subsidy of a million dollars per year to the large mail-order houses in the carriage of their catalogs. I cannot see how any Member could be opposed to this legislation. It provides enough revenue to make the carriage and the delivery of catalogs self-sustaining. I know that you are not in favor of a subsidy for sending catalogs through the mail.

May I say to the gentleman on my left that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads is making a study now of first-, second-, and third-class matter, and expects to bring in bills readjusting the rates on those classes of mail. But we cannot do it all in one bill. I appeal to the Members of this House to support this measure because it is good, sound legislation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Illinois that I rise again in order to correct some of the misunderstandings which have resulted from some of the speeches that have been made since I spoke the first time on this measure. I was very much interested in the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. who was entirely correct when he told the House the large mail-order houses ship their catalogs by freight into the local communities and distribute them there at the low postage rate, which is not changed in the first bracket, except on the second pound or more.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we have doubled the rate on the second, third, fourth, and fifth pounds, and all of those catalogs weigh that much. Therefore it is that big catalog that is going to carry the burden even in the local deliveries.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from Illinois, coming as he does from the State known as the home of the great mail-order houses, should know that practically all of their large catalogs are no longer being distributed by mail.

Perhaps such was not the case when he was a boy and was more familiar with the catalogs which he received by mail.

But in recent years there has been developed a new system of shipping these catalogs into various local areas and distributing them by individual door-to-door carriers, rather than by mail, in order to save money.

However, I want to go to another point which the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee failed entirely to mention.

There are two or three large mailorder houses in this country that may possibly get a small advantage here. But there are literally thousands upon thousands, if you please, of small manufacturers who are sending out their small catalogs to the small businessmen, over whom some have been crying here today, for that is the way the small businessmen purchase the commodities and goods they sell. They buy from the catalogs sent to them by the small manufacturers.

What you are actually doing by this type of legislation is to place a burden upon the small manufacturers of this Nation at the very time when we are trying to reconvert back to peacetime pro-

duction.

I am not interested in the large mailorder houses, these three or four concerns that the gentleman-has in mind and which he knows so well. Instead, I am interested in the thousands upon thousands of little manufacturers and small businessmen over the country who use their service and who will be penalized by this bill.

Remember the postal service as a whole is a profit-making venture today. Remember that the small manufacturers are also using first-class postage, and by the passage of this bill the first-class postage of this country will in no way be reduced but will simply increase, if you please, the profits of the Post Office Department

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. McKenzie].

Mr. McKENZIE. It seems to happen so often when a matter of this kind comes up that there is a lot of misunderstanding. It is bound to be a misunderstanding, because I do not believe there is a Member of this House who would be guilty of a deliberate misstatement.

A few minutes ago the gentleman from Ohio made reference to the fact that the small businesses were the ones who were going to be affected by this particular piece of legislation. I do not think I can agree with the gentleman. Perhaps he draws his information from sources different from what I do. But I must assure him that rather than retarding the activities of small business I am pretty sure that this particular bit of legislation will give small businesses a reasonable chance to do business. If he will look at the schedule he will notice in the local zone, which is the place that small business is going to circularize its trade, the rate has not changed. It is the same rate. Then, as you go on out into the several zones, there is some increase in the rate. It so happens that most of the pepole who make the most use of catalogs, in spite of all my friend has said, are the big mail order houses and the big corporations who are sending

out their prospectuses and price lists and what have you all over the country. It is true they do send a lot of that stuff by truck and by rail. Of course, that which they do send by truck and by rail does not affect the Post Office Department. Therefore, whether the rate is increased or cut in half does not make any difference to the Post Office Department and neither would it make any difference to that particular type of user.

So that argument does not carry any weight at all. I just simply cannot see it. If we want to protect small business. the boy who is coming back from the service and going into business, the chap who only has a few thousand dollars, a part of which he has probably borrowed from some bank on his GI guarantee and the rest of which he has saved during the many months he has been overseas in the South Pacific or perhaps on board some ship where he does not get to shore more than once every 2 or 3 months and then on some coral island. if you want to help out that poor kid who needs help and cooperation and give him a chance to do business in his local community, he should be protected from these big chain organizations. Let those big mail order houses pay the freight on what they are sending. It is common sense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired. Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to answer the charge that was made a little while ago that we had a considerable surplus at this time in the Post Office Department. Let us face this thing fairly. We do have a surplus today. We had one of \$5,000,-000 in the previous fiscal year, but this is the first surplus in 14 years. If you will take the Post Office Department statement for the past 14 years you will find the Post Office Department has lost more than a quarter of a billion dollars. Where did that money come from? It came from the pockets of the taxpayers, because every one of those annual deficits was made up by a deficit appropriation which you Members of the House had to vote. Therefore it so happens that over a normal period of time there is a deficit in the Post Office.

The reason that first-class mail today is making a profit is because you raised the local rate from 2 cents to 3 cents, and because of the fact that so many people are dislocated, working in war industries and places like that and they are writing back home and the folks at home are writing to them. The boys in the service write back home free, but the letters going to them are either going by air mail or by first-class mail and paid for. That has built up an artificial volume of mail, which will not pertain when we get back to normal times.

Now, if we are going to be factual about this thing, this is the time to adjust it while we do know what we can do. It will not be half as bad as when you get into the hole and business has gotten bad and you try to raise the rates.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. I yield.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that the amount added to the cost of the Post Office Department by the recent increase in the salaries which we adopted a few weeks ago will more than offset the surplus we have in the Department at the present time?

Mr. McKENZIE. Not quite, for this reason: The surplus is roughly today \$150,000,000. When we revert back to normal times under the salary bill and eliminate the overtime it will probably cost somewhere in the neighborhood of eighty-five or ninety million dollars. So that it is not quite used up. But when we revert to normal times the volume of first-class mail will drop off, too, because people will be back home and not writing. I urge the Members to face the facts and vote for this bill so as to put the burden of transporting this strictly business mail on the business firms who use it and profit by it. It is unfair to put this burden on the taxpayer. He has more than he can carry now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, getting back to small business and what effect this bill would have on it, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] to the fact that in the local zones there is no increase on 1-pound catalogs or pamphlets or booklets sent out by small business. In the second zone there is a 1-cent increase. In the third zone there is only a 1-cent increase, and so on to the eighth zone, a 1-cent increase over-all on 1-pound packages.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Gladly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from Ohio was accenting the use of this service by the small manufacturer who has national distribution; not the small manufacturer who mails only in his local community.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Then I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on the 1-pound catalog mailed by the small manufacturer to the eighth zone there is only a 1-cent increase in the present postage rate. Suppose that same manufacturer mails a 5pound package. In the local zone the postage is increased one-half cent for each additional pound. In the first and second zones it is increased one-half cent. In the third zone it is the same as the present rate. In the fourth zone it is decreased one-half cent; in the fifth zone it is decreased 1 cent for each additional pound; in the sixth zone it is decreased 11/2 cents, and in the seventh zone it is decreased from 6 cents to 41/2 cents, and in the eighth zone it is decreased 2 cents.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am very glad the gentleman brought that out because the large shipment is the one that is sent out by the large catalog house and not by the small manufacturer. So actually you are helping the very people that so many persons have said we do not want to help.

You are helping the large mail order houses.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The large mail order houses who have the large catalogs usually ship those catalogs into an area and send them in the local, first, second, and third zones of that area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again ex-

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Gladly.

Mr. MASON. I wish to state that the gentleman from Ohio himself said that the large catalogue houses took advantage of the opportunity of trucking to the distant places, so they could not get the advantage that we are giving in those distant zones. Now, he cannot be both fish and fowl, he has got to keep his argument consistent; he cannot argue against himself in this matter and argue the other way in the other matter.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. And the provisions of this bill are to take care of a

situation of just that kind.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gen-tleman yield long enough for me to comment that that is just exactly what I said? That I simply quoted the argument of the gentleman from Missouri, not mine. If the large companies continue to use it on that basis-

Mr. COLE of Missouri. If the large companies continue to use the mail service to distribute their catalogues.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We make it possible for them to use it again by your reduction.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Let me finish my sentence, please. If the large mail order houses continue to use the mail up to the third zone in distributing their catalogs they are going to pay the increased cost of distribution, they are going to make up this amount that we have been subsidizing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, there is a refreshing and unusual situation in the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. It has been rather shocking and gratifying to me, being a committeeman from Texas, to find that the Republicans on the committee and the Democrats usually agree. It is rather shocking to some people, at times, but there seems to be good reason for it and I think you ought to consider it from this standpoint: That your committee feels the responsibility of recommending to this House sound legislation based upon this proposition—that the Government owes no debt either to big or small business from the standpoint of hauling around their catalogs and their other matériel except on a basis of what it costs; no more, no less. I am sure we did not consider whether it would help big business or small business or whether it would hurt them; it was simply the proposition that we felt we owed it to the people of the United States to recommend to the best of our ability con-

structive and nonpartisan legislationthere may be something wrong with itwe all agreed on it, however, taking a cost-ascertainment system that we believed was good. I must say frankly that I believe it is impossible to bring in a complete bill at one time including all of the subjects some of the gentlemen desire. We feel that this was the best way to do it. There is a lot of talk about subsidies. Perhaps they are good, perhaps they are bad; but we felt it was the sense of this House that we should not use subsidies in our postal system, that the people of America, individuals and business, were desirous of paying exactly what it cost to transmit their mail.

There is a considerable surplus, I understand, in first-class postage. I hope that will be considered soon by the committee and that we can recommend a reduction in those rates to make it purely upon a cost basis.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield. Mr. DONDERO. If I understand the proposition, it means this: We are simply asking big business and small business to pay their way as they go.

Mr. LYLE. As one member of the committee, that is all I ask.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman. will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would ask the gentleman if he feels the same about r.ewspapers.

Mr. LYLE. I certainly do.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman feels that newspapers should pay their way also?

Mr. LYLE. I do.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. And the gentleman is diligently working to bring out a bill to make newspapers pay their own

Mr. LYLE. I attend every meeting of the committee and do my small share.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Can the gentleman give the House any assurance when that bill is coming before the House for consideration?

Mr. LYLE. As a very low-ranking member I would not dare do that. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Burch] or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason | can probably enlighten the gentleman on that.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I understand that hearings on first, second, and thirdclass mail rates will start immediately after the recess.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STARKEY].

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debates in the House and I am somewhat confused by the arguments that have been made on the other They talk about profits and they talk about taxes. One minute they refer to the income from the Post Office Department as profits and then if you want to increase the rates it becomes no longer a matter of loss or profit, it becomes a matter of taxes.

It appears to me that what we are doing is taking the profits on first-class mail, because that is actually run at a profit, it is over and above cost, and giving it to some other group of citizens who use another class of postal service. are actually taxing the users of firstclass mail and when it is turned into the Treasury Department you refer to it as a profit. So we are taking the profit that the Government makes on this venture and actually giving it to another group of citizens. I do not think that is very democratic. I think all groups of citizens ought to be treated the same way. To whom are we giving this profit or overcharge that we are making from the citizens who use the first-class mail? We are not giving it to all the people, nor to all people engaged in the sale and distribution of consumer goods. We are subsidizing the mail-order houses who are the competitors of the independent local merchants. So that the farther you go into it the more undemocratic the whole affair seems to be.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman. will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand the gentleman, his argument is that all users of mail should be treated exactly alike and that the same rate should be applied to all in each classification.

Mr. STARKEY. I did not say that. Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Just what was the gentleman's statement?

Mr. STARKEY. I said that you were overcharging a certain group of citizens who are using a certain type of mail and giving it to another group within a group. Frankly, I say that the committee did absolutely right when it brought in these different classifications one at a time. and I will say further that the bill and the increase in rates does not wholly cover the cost, and there is still being paid some subsidy to the catalogers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute in order that I may ask him a question. It is not true that our Post Office and Post Roads Committee voted this bill unanimously?

Mr. STARKEY. Yes.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not also true that the Post Office and Post Roads Committee is simply carrying out a mandate of Congress enacted in 1928, which says "that all fourth-class mail matter should produce revenue commensurate with the cost of the service"?

Mr. STARKEY. That is written right into the law.

Mr. BREHM. And until we repeal that act, there is nothing else we can do if we are going to carry out the mandate of the Congress.

Mr. STARKEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. TRAYNOR].

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, may I say that I believe each and every department of the Post Office should be self-sustaining. We should be just before we are generous.

I am opposed to the Government subsidizing these mail-order houses that are in competition with the small merchants in the rural districts who are carrying a stock and giving service. I was very much surprised at statements made by the representatives of the large mail-order houses through their claim of educating the public. I am a man of letters and I did not get my education out of catalogs. I paid for it by going through a university.

The railroads charge the Government by weight and space; therefore the catalogs should pay their just carrying charges.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAYNOR. I yield to the gentle-

man from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. If a man is required to pay the cost of an actual service rendered and no more, does the gentleman think that could properly be called a tax?

Mr. TRAYNOR. That is very debatable as to whether the service is rendered or whether it is not rendered.

Mr. HANCOCK. If we pay the actual cost of the service to the Government, that is not a tax by any possible stretch of the imagination.

Mr. TRAYNOR. That is the gentleman's idea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware has expired.

(Mr. TRAYNOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the Record, and that the bill be open to amendment in its entirety.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the first day of the third month following the date of approval of this act the rate of postage on parcels, other than publications entered as second-class matter, weighing more than 8 ounces but not exceeding 10 pounds, containing catalogs and similar printed matter in bound form consisting of less than 50 percent of reading matter other than advertising matter, with or without samples of merchandise affixed thereto, and incidental related enclosures; directories or lists of in-dividuals, firms, or organizations; reports or prospectuses of corporations, organizations, and institutions; price lists or tariff schedules; industrial manuals and bound volumes of publications and volumes of printed mat-ter similar in character, when mailed under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, shall be as follows: On all such matter mailed at the post office from which a rural route starts, for delivery on such route, or mailed at any point on such route for delivery at any other point thereon, or at the office from which the route starts, or on any rural route starting therefrom, and on all such matter mailed at a letter-carrier office, or at any point within its delivery limits, for delivery by carriers from that office, or at any office for local delivery, 5 cents for the first pound or fraction of a pound and 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction of a pound.

or fraction of a pound.

For delivery within the first or second zone, except as provided in the next preceding paragraph, 6 cents for the first pound or fraction of a pound and 1.5 cents for each additional pound or fraction of a pound, and except where the distance by the shortest regular mail route from the office of origin to the office of delivery is 300 miles or more, in which case the rates of postage shall be the same as for delivery within the third zone.

For delivery within the third zone, 7 cents for the first pound or fraction of a pound and 2 cents for each additional pound or fraction of a pound.

For delivery within the fourth zone, 8 cents for the first pound or fraction of a pound and 2.5 cents for each additional pound or fraction of a pound.

For delivery within the fifth zone, 9 cents for the first pound or fraction of a pound and 3 cents for each additional pound or fraction of a pound.

For delivery within the sixth zone, 10 cents for the first pound or fraction of a pound and 3.5 cents for each additional pound or fraction of a pound.

For delivery within the seventh zone, 11 cents for the first pound or fraction of a pound and 4.5 cents for each additional pound or fraction of a pound

pound or fraction of a pound.

For delivery within the eighth zone and between the Philippine Islands and any portion of the United States, including the District of Columbia, and the several Territories and possessions, 12 cents for the first pound or fraction of a pound and 5 cents for each additional pounds or fraction of a pound:

Provided, That a fraction of a cent in the total amount of postage on any parcel shall be computed as a full cent: And provided further, That for parcels in this classification of mail matter weighing in excess of 10 pounds and up to 70 pounds the rates shall be the same as those charged for books.

SEC. 2. Effective as of the first day of the third month following the date of approval of this act, section 403, title IV, of the act of February 25, 1944 (58 Stat. 69), insofar as it pertains to mail matter the rates of postage upon which are revised by the first section of this act, is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, after the semicolon, insert, "or containing bound volumes, with or without incidental related enclosures, of."

Page 2, line 7, strike out, "of publications and volumes."

Page 4, beginning with line 1, strike out, "And provided further, That for parcels in this classification of mail matter weighing in excess of 10 pounds and up to 70 pounds the rates shall be the same as those charged for books."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am exceedingly interested in this legislation, but it seems to me that the problem has been very greatly oversimplified by the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and by numerous other statements made by members of the

Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. When the statement is made that the question involved here is a simple question as to whether or not we propose to subsidize the users of fourthclass mail in the mailing of catalogs to the extent of \$1,000,000, I believe that is an overstatement of simplification of the problem.

I call your attention to this fact. While it is true that the senders of catalogs who may be operating in my town or your town in a small business and sending them out into only the first zone are not paying any additional rates under this bill, I want you to understand and I believe we have had some discussion of it in the Post Office Subcommittee on Appropriations, of which I happen to be a member, that the problem is not as simple as the gentleman from Illinois has stated.

I would like to have the gentleman from Illinois show me where in his report or in the hearings consideration has been given to the profit to first-class mail resulting from the mail that flows from the use of these catalogs to the mail-order houses? As a matter of fact, I recall that when the soldiers were given the free-mailing privilege, dire distress signals went up and they said that that was going to cause a great burden on the Post Office Department if you gave to the soldiers the right of free mail.

Oh, what a burden was going to be put on the Post Office Department! As a matter of fact, after they checked the record, it now appears that for practically every letter that is sent free by the soldiers there have been seven letters going to the soldiers upon which first class mail privileges have been paid. The fact of the matter is that you cannot disas-sociate in the post-office operation the fourth-class mail from the first-class mail or second-class mail, and simplify the thing as easily as that, because when you send a catalog out to a customer, the customer has to write to that person to send in an order. That letter carries first-class mail. The postage is paid at first-class rates. He usually buys a money order and he pays for that at the post office. Then, the company that issues the catalog delivers the article by parcel post, and parcel post is paid, and if they make a mistake there will be a continuation of correspondence upon which letters first-class postage will be paid. So when you attempt to simplify this matter and say that you can on a cost ascertainment basis demonstrate that the carrying of catalogs carries a subsidy of a million dollars, I defy anybody in the Post Office Department Cost Ascertainment Division to come before this or any other committee and demonstrate to a nicety that his facts are accurate. I know they are not, because in order to demonstrate the subsidy that must be paid and is paid-a million dollars to the great mail-order houses—, you have to take into consideration the profit that accrues to the Post Office Department from the first-class mail that is generated by the issuance of those cata-

I want to say to the committee that I think they are trying to do a good job.

I think this problem should be approached but I dislike to have the word go out to the small catalog issuers in my district who do cover more than a local area that they are being subsidized to the extent of a million dollars a year and that therefore we should take it away from them. They are stimulating the first-class mail that causes that profit and that surplus in the Post Office Department that comes from the issuance

of these catalogs, if you please. Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin says the problem has been oversimplified when it has been stated solely as a matter of subsidizing the catalog houses, and he goes ahead to prove his point that it is oversimplified by bringing up the point that catalogs generate a profit in the first-class mail business and causes parcel-post packages to be sent and money orders to be bought and all of these things that are natural consequences or the result of the use of the catalog. But the gentleman from Wisconsin also oversimplifies the point because on parcel post we have been losing some seven million dollars a year, and on the money-order business we have been losing money. Therefore, when we generate that kind of business we are just increasing the losses rather than making up for the losses. The only thing that we have made a profit on in the Post Office Department over the last 20 years has been the one class of mail, that is, first-class mail.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield. Mr. BREHM. The gentleman from Wisconsin also referred to the vast amount of revenue derived from firstclass mail being sent to the soldiers. This war is going to be over someday and we cannot anticipate that in the future you are going to have that revenue. We hope those boys will be home one of these days. We are not just legislating for the day. This is permanent legislation.

Mr. MASON. Oh, yes. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that while mail has gone to the soldier boys at the ratio of 7 to 1, it was not the one free letter coming back from the soldier boy that generated the seven letters to him because at least six of those letters would have gone to him anyway. So it is a matter of oversimplification perhaps on both sides.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield. Mr. GARY. Is it not a fact that in carrying these seven or eight letters which have been generated supposedly by this one letter from a serviceman that those letters are from the mothers, wives, and relatives of the serviceman and we should realize the Government is making a profit on the carrying of that mail, whereas the Government is carrying the catalogs for the mail-order houses at less than cost?

Mr. MASON. I want to thank the gentleman for his pertinent remarks on this question.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes: I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. If the argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin is sound, we ought to send catalogs free of charge and thus produce that much more first-

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose: and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLARK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3238) readjusting the rates of postage on catalogs and similar printed advertising and other matter of fourthclass mail, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 292, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to. The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 187, nays 148, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 131] YEAS-187

Abernethy Cravens Allen, La. Andrews, Ala. Crosser Curley Auchincloss Bailey Barrett, Pa. Bates, Ky. Beckworth Biemiller Blackney Bolton Boykin Bradley, Pa. Brehm Brooks Brown, Ga. Buck Bulwinkle Burgin Byrne, N Y. Camp Cannon, Fla. Cannon, Mo. Carlson Carnahan Case, N. J. Clark Cochran Coffee Cole, Mo. Colmer Combs Cooper Courtney

Hare Delaney, James J. Harris Havenner Delaney, John J. Healy Hedrick Dolliver Domengeaux Hoch Huber Izac Doughton, N. C. Jackson Douglas, Calif. Douglas, Ill. Luther A. Kean Doyle Drewry Kee Kelley, Pa. Durham Dworshak Kelly, Ill. Eberharter Kerr King Kirwan Elliott Engle, Calif. Kopplemann Larcade Ervin Feighan Fisher Lea Flannagan LeFevre Link Flood Lyle McCormack Fogarty Forand Gallagher Gamble Gardner McDonough McGehee McKenzie Garv Madden Gathings Maloney Manasco Mansfield, Mont. Mansfield, Tex. Geelan Gibson Gore Gossett Granahan Marcantonio Grant, Ala. Mason Green Michener Gregory

Hagen Hale

Hancock

Miller, Calif. Mills Monroney Morgan Murdock Murphy Murray, Tenn. Neely Norrell Norton O'Brien, Mich. Pace Patman Patterson Peterson, Ga. Pickett Poage Price, Fla. Price, Ill. Quinn, N. Y. Rabaut Rabin

Adams

Arends

Bennet, N. Y.

Bennett, Mo.

Brown, Ohio Brumbaugh

Byrnes, Wis.

Campbell Canfield Case, S. Dak.

Chenoweth

Church

Clevenger

Cole, Kans. Cunningham

D'Alesandro

Clason

Curtis

Davis D'Ewart Dirksen

Ellsworth

Engel, Mich. Fallon

Ellis

Elston

Fellows Fenton

Fulton

Gavin

Gearhart

Gerlach Gifford

Gillespie Gillette

Anderson.

Barden

Bell Bender

B'oom

Boren

Buckley

Butler

Celler Chiperfield Clements Cole, N. Y.

Cooley Crawford

Dawson

Dickstein

Earthman

Elsaesser

Barry

Bryson

Buffett

Allen, Ill.

Andersen, H. Carl

Ramspeck Randolph Richards Robertson, N. Dak Robertson, Va. Thomas Robinson, Utah Torrens Robinson, Ky. Roe, Md. Rogers, Fla. Rogers, N. Y Rooney Rowan Ryter Sasscer Savage Sikes Slaughter Smith, Maine Snyder Sparkman Spence NAVS-148

Starkey Stevenson Sullivan Sumners, Tex. Sundstrom Tarver Thomas, Tex. Traynor Voorhis, Calif. Vorys, Ohio Wadsworth Wasielewski Weaver Weiss West Whittington Wickersham Winstead Wood Woodhouse Zimmerman

Mahon

Gillie Goodwin Gordon Gorski Anderson, Calif. Graham Andresen, Griffiths August H. Gross Gwinn, N. Y. Gwynne, Iowa Arends Arnold Baldwin, N. Y. Barrett, Wyo. Bates, Mass. Beall Halleck Harless, Ariz. Harness, Ind. Henry Herter Heselton Bishop Bradley, Mich. Hill Hoffman Holmes, Mass Holmes, Wash. Hope Horan Howell Hull Jenkins Jensen Johnson, Calif. Johnson, Ill. Johnson, Lydon B Johnson, Okla. Jonkman Keefe Kefauver Kilday Kinzer Kunkel Landis Latham LeCompte Lemke

Martin, Mass. Miller, Nebr. Mott Mundt Murray, Wis. O'Brien, Ill. O'Hara O'Konski O'Neal Outland Patrick Philbin Phillips Pittenger Powers Rains Ramey Rankin Reece, Tenn, Reed, Ill. Reed. N. Y. Rees, Kans. Rizley Rockwell Rogers, Mass. Schwabe Mo. Schwabe, Okla. Scrivner Shafer Sheridan Short Simpson, Ill. Smith, Wis. Springer Stockman Taber Talbot Talle Thomas, N. J. Tibbott Vursell Weichel Wigglesworth Wolcott Wolfenden, Pa. Wolverton, N. J. Woodruff, Mich. McGregor McMillan, S. C.

NOT VOTING-98

Lewis

Ludlow

McConnell McCowen

Luce

Fernandez N. Mex. Andrews, N. Y. Fuller Baldwin, Md. Granger Grant, Ind. Hall. Edwin Arthur Hall, Leonard W Hart Hartley Hays Hébert Heffernan Hendricks Hinshaw Hobbs Holifield Daughton, Va. Hook Jarman Jennings Johnson, Ind. Jones

Keogh

Kilburn LaFollette Lane Lanham Lesinski Lynch McGlinchey McMillen, Ill. Martin, Iowa Merrow Morrison O'Toole Peterson, Fla Pfeifer Plumley Powell Rayfiel Rich Riley Rivers Rodgers. Pa. Roe, N. Y Russell Sabath Sadow ki

Sharp Sharp Sheppard Simpson, Pa. Smith, Ohio Smith, Va. Somers, N. Y. Stewart

Sumner, Ill. Taylor Thom Thomason Tolan Towe Vinson Walter

Welch White Whitten Wilson Winter Woodrum, Va. Worley

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Tolan for, with Mr. Kilburn against. Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Hook against. Mr. Woodrum of Virginia for, with Mr.

Morrison against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Jennings. Mr. Clements with Mr. Fuller.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Campbell. Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Andrews of New

Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. Daughton of Virginia with Mr. Welch. Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Taylor. Mr. Barden with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Case of New Jersey changed his vote from "no" to "ave."

Mr. Adams changed his vote from "aye"

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3550. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Thomas of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. Overton, Mr. Russell, Mr. Thomas of Utah, Mr. Gurney, Mr. Brooks, and Mr. Burton to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIA-TION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1946

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3550) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. Powers, Mr. Engel of Michigan, and Mr. Case of South Dakota.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein one newspaper article and three newspaper editorials on the part Montana has played in the present bond drive.

Mr. JUDD (at the request of Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include therein a letter from the Northwest Lumbermen's Association containing constructive criticism of the OPA.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT: WHAT IS IT?-HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an index to a volume I have prepared.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker. At the request of several Members of Congress and many officials of public schools and colleges throughout the country who are using the booklet as a textbook, I have revised and brought up to date House Document No. 619 of the Seventyseventh Congress, Second Session, on Our American Government-What Is It? How Does It Function? and it will be ready for printing and distribution within the next week or 10 days. It contains 64 pages, 279 questions and answers and has been referred to as a comprehensive story of the history and functions of our American Government interestingly and accurately portraved.

House Concurrent Resolution No. 60 unanimously passed the House on May 31, 1945, and unanimously passed the Senate on June 1, 1945, authorizing the printing of the revised booklet as a public document, and each Member of Congress will receive without cost about 100 copies for free distribution which will probably be enough to fill individual requests.

In the event a Member should desire additional copies, if the order is placed for the printing to be done when a supply is being printed for sale at the Government Printing Office, the cost will be \$17.50 per thousand; the order should be placed with Mr. Ralph L. Harris, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Clerk in Statuary Hall of the Capitol. If anyone not a Member of Congress desires to place such an order, it will be necessary for the order to be placed through a Member of Congress, or it will not be recognized by the Government Printing Office. These booklets will be available for sale through the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, at 10 cents per copy when they are printed and made available.

This booklet has been revised four times and there has been a big demand for each edition. More than a million copies of one edition of this booklet were sold. It is strictly nonpartisan and nonpolitical. In order that those who are interested may know its contents, I am inserting herewith the index to the document for insertion in the daily Congres-SIONAL RECORD, but not to be included in the permanent bound volumes, as follows:

INDEX

[Citations are to question numbers]

[Citations are to question numbers	
Que	stion
	No.
	131
Acts. (See Laws.)	
Advertising, in franked newspapers, re-	
striction on	281
striction onAdvisory opinions by Supreme Court	201
American's Creed	203
Apportionment of Representatives_ 25, 3	18, 39
Appropriations customarily originate in the House	
in the House	141
Bar in the Capitol	55
Bar in the Capitol	1, 12
Bills (see also Laws):	2
Committee control of	101
Disposition after signature by Presi-	100
The section of	120
House how introduced	7 00
dent	11,00
dent	193
dent Largest number introduced in one	100
Procedure in passage of	27
Relation to "acts"	131
Sent to President, courses of action	
on	117
onSenate, how introducedSignature by President, ceremony at	88
Signature by President, ceremony at	125
"Brain Trust" advisers to President	-
Roosevelt	189
Cabinet, information concerning	184.
185, 186	3, 190
Calendars, legislative	104
Campaign expenses of Members not de-	
ductible for income-tax purposes	280
Candidate, origin of termCapital of the United States, informa-	21
Capital of the United States, informa-	
tion concerning 204, 200 Capitol Building:	5, 215
Capitol Building:	2
Eating, smoking, drinking in	53, 55
Information concerning construc-	religion.
tion, etc200	5, 209
Chinese exclusion acts repealed	205
Uninese exclusion acts repealed	200
Citizenship restricted to certain races_	260
Civil-service appointments, congres-	OFC
sional influence	200
	255
Civil-service employees, number of 25	2, 203
Clark, Hon. Champ, on seniority sys- tem	07
"Clean bill"	199
"Clean bill" Cloture rule, in Senate Code of the Laws of the United States	115
Code of the Laws of the United States	130
Code of the Laws of the United States_ Coins, extent to which legal tender	246
Committee of the Whole	105
Committees:	
Enumeration, Senate and House	94, 95
Enumeration, Senate and House Necessity for; selection; functions,	
etc93. 9	6-101
Concurrent resolutions	132
Conference committee	
Congress.	
Activities, how controlled	73
Adjournment by President	34
Activities, how controlledAdjournment by PresidentConstitutional status as bicameral	
legislature	28, 29

Question	• Question	Question
Congress—Continued No.	No.	No.
Express and implied powers, differ-	Flag to the Americas 233	Impeachment, not subject to 51
ence between 52	Franking of mail matter by Member	Income tax, payment of 280
House of meeting 35	of Congress63, 272	Oath of 40
Legislates for the District of Colum-	Franking privileges of Members, ex-	Offices 56
bia 217	tends to certain foreign countries 277	Residence in Washington 50
Number of Members from each	Franking privilege to widows of Presi-	Salary 46
State 38	dents 175	Service not a source of wealth 48
Proceedings, records of 238-240	"General pair" 109	Minority leader 78, 79
Session of 31, 32	"Gentleman's agreement," explanation	Mutilated currency, redemption of 247
Special session of 33	of 84	National Anthem, information con-
Term of 30	Gerrymandering 26	cerning 234, 235
Visitors, allowed in galleries 64	Government agencies, sources of infor-	Naturalization, restrictions on; oath_ 260, 261
Congressional districts:	mation about 249	Newspapers, free of postage within
Boundaries of 25	Government documents, how ob-	county 273-274, 281
Population of 26, 27	tained237, 240, 241	Newspapers, justification for low postal
Congressional Record:	Government Printing Office 236-241	rates on 282
Memorials introduced, notation of 86,271	Hearings on bills 100	Nicknames of President 178
Official record of debates, etc.; distri-	Hoban, James, architect of White	Oath of members of armed services 252
bution 238-240, 271	House 211	Oath of members of bar of Supreme
Not censored; usual contents 270, 271	House of Representatives:	Court 195
Congressman, designation includes	Legislative calendars 104	Oath of Members of Congress 40, 41
Senator 36	Procedure, rules of 83	Oath of Justices of Supreme Court 194
Congresswoman 58	Proceedings, customary order of 82	Oath of the President 146
"Conscience fund" 248	Officers of 78	Oath of Vice President, administration
Constitution:	Organization at beginning of Con-	of 180
Act of the people 16	gress76	Oath of naturalization 261
Amendment, procedure 10, 12	Presiding officer of 75	Oratory, value of, in Congress 129
"Lame duck" amendment 13	Seating arrangements 68	Page, William Tyler, author of Amer-
Original, where kept; wartime pro-	Stages of a bill 87	ican's Creed 263
tection 8,9	Standing committees 95-101	Pages, Senate and House 65,66
Preamble4	Voting, methods of 106, 107	Pairing, information concerning 108-109
Relation to the Convention of 17877	"H. R." meaning of, on a bill 103	Parliamentary practice of House,
Constitutional amendment:	Immigration, restrictions on 258	sources83
Necessary, to change date of inaugu-	Impeachment, Congressmen not sub-	Party leaders in Congress 79
ration or term of Congress 15	ject to 51	Penalty mail272
Validity, challenge by private citi-	Impeachment of President Johnson 153	Pensions to Presidents' widows 175
zen 199	Inauguration Day, as holiday 219	Petitions to Congress 86
Convention of 17877	Income tax, proposal to restrict maxi-	Pocket veto 119, 120
Copyright deposits in Library of Con-	mum rate14	Political parties:
gress 250	Indirect democracy1	Information concerning first major_ 19
Correspondence with Congressmen 62,63	Japan, declaration of war against 138	Not contemplated by Constitution 17
Courtesy rule regarding correspond-	Joint resolutions 132	Why formed 18
ence 62	Journals of the two Houses 238	Polk, James K., only Speaker to be-
	Judicial branch, number of employees_ 253	come President 275
Dawes, Charles G., statement regarding	"Kitchen Cabinet" of President Jack-	
		Postal savings, as a war effort 279
	"Lame duck" amendment 13	Postal service, encouragement of dis-
Death of Member of Congress 42, 43	Laws enacted, comparison with num-	semination of knowledge, by low
	ber of bills introduced 134	rates on papers, etc 273-274, 281
	Laws, exact time of, approved by Presi-	Postmaster General, tenure of office 190
Declaration of Indopendence 161	dent, when indicated 191	President: 4
Declaration of Independence, where	Laws, naming of 128	
kept: wartime protection8,9 Declaration of war, by Congress 137, 138	Laws of the United States, publication of 130	Beginning of term, date 147, 148
	OI 130 Laws, public and private 135-136	Bills passed by Congress, action on 117-119
	"Legal tender," meaning of; extent 245, 246	Congress calling or adjournment of 90 04
	Legislative branch, number of em-	Congress, calling or adjournment of 33, 34
		How to determine whether President
	ployees 253 Legislative counsel 47	is in White House 213
Discharge Calendar; House 101		Messages to Congress 176
District of Columbia:		Oath of office 146
See also Capital of United States.	Library of Congress 266	Qualifications for 145
	Buildings 264, 266 Copyright deposits 250	Resignation 165
Government of 216, 217	National library establishment	Salary and allowances 163, 164
	National library; establishment,	Services of data concerning 150, 151
	present size 267-269 Limitation of debate, in House and	Succession to office of 149, 159-162
Education extent of Education 1		Uniform 179
Education, extent of Federal aid 251 Election of 1944, voting by members of	Senate	President-elect, death or failure to
armed services		qualify, effect 161, 162
armed services 278	Mace, information on 72 Mail, United States:	President pro tempore of Senate 74
Election of President 17-20		Presidents:
Election of Senators and Representa-	Franking privilege of Congress-	Impeachment of Andrew Johnson 153
tives 22-24	men 63, 272, 277 Newspapers, special postage rates 273,	Married in the White House 171
Electoral college 20		Nicknames 178
Employees in Government service 252-255	Penalty 274, 281, 282	From west of the Mississippi 173
Enabling act, for admission of State 221	Penalty 272	Who have died in office 152, 158
"Executive journal" 238	Maine elections, why held in Septem-	Who have served in Congress 168
Executive offices 212	Majority leader in House information	Who have served two terms 151
Executive orders; classification 143	Majority leader in House, information	Who have signed bills twice 193
Ex-Presidents, information concern-	concerning 77-80, 85	Who were born in log cabins 171
ing 166, 167, 169	Members of Congress:	President's widow, allowances to 175
Fillbusters, information concerning 112_115	See also Representatives and Sen-	Press gallery 64
First Lady 174	ators.	Previous question 110
riag:	Allowance of Congressional Records. 240	Printing for the United States Gov-
Design, evolution of 225	Appointments in civil service, influ-	ernment 236
Flag Code 230	encing of 256	Proclamations by President, effect of 144
Half staff 231	Duties of 49	Propagandists, foreign, registration
Improper uses of 228	Form of communication to 57	of 259
Over Capitol Building 208	Franking privilege 63,272	Pure democracy1
Pledge to 226, 227	How reached when House is in ses-	Qualifications for President 145
Salute to 230	sion 69	Qualifications for Representatives 45

	stion No.
Qualifications for SenatorsQuorum in the House of Representa-	44
tives	91 107 1
Constitutional qualifications First woman elected	45 59
Vacancy in office, how filled	43
Republican form of government	2,3
Republican Party, evolution of name Resident Commissioners	37
Resolutions, varieties ofRestaurants in the Capitol	132
Restaurants in the Capitol 100	53 3, 114
Roll calls in House 100 Rules Committee, House, functions_ 111 Salary of Members of Congress	1, 112 46
Salary of President and Vice President163	3, 183
Salary of Supreme Court Justices Seal of the United States, custody	196
and use ofSeat of Government	224
Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce,	La K
and Labor, why omitted from succession to the Presidency Senate:	160
Presiding officer of Procedure on introduction of bills_	74 88
Seating arrangement	67
Standing committees enumerated Constitutional qualifications	94
First woman to serve as	60
Procedure in obtaining recognition.	89
Vacancy in office, how filled Senatorial courtesy, meaning of term_	92
Senior Senator, definition of term	71
Seniority rule, meaning of Separation of powers, under Consti-	97
tution	
election of 1944	278
Smoking in Congress	54 77
an elected Member of the House	276
Speaker of the House who became President	275
Special sessions of Congress	33
cerning 98 Star-Spangled Banner 23 States:	4, 235
Form of government, constitutional	223
How created 22	0, 221
How created22 Representation in Congress Steering committee, House of Repre-	38
sentatives15	85 9-162
Superintendent of Documents, sales agent for Government publica-	
cations28 Supreme Court:	7, 241
Advisory opinions	201
Bar, oath of members; admission_ 19	5, 202 197
Building Decisions, printing of	203
Difference between decisions and opinions	
Oath of justices	200 194
Oath of justicesOriginal jurisdiction	198
Salary of the justices "Supreme law of the land"	196
Tax bills, origin in the House14 "Tennis Cabinet" of President Theo-	
dore Roosevelt Texas, question of division into several	189
StatesTime of approval of bills by President,	191
when indicated	257
Twentieth amendment	148
Twenty-second amendment Unanimous consent, transaction of business under	112
VE-day, meaning of	

	estion
	No.
Vacancies in office of Senator or Rep-	
resentative	
Veto, information concerning 11	7-124
Vice President:	
Attendance at Cabinet meetings 18	
Oath of	180
Official residence for	182
Official title	181
Resignation	187
Salary	183
Vice Presidents who have become Presi-	
dent	186
Visitors in House and Senate galleries.	64
Voluntary service for Government	244
War agencies, number of employees	254
War, information about declarations	1000
of, by Congress 13	7, 138
War, legal definition of	139
War time, origin of; effect 24	2, 243
Washington, Justice Bushrod, defini-	
tion of "war"	139
Well of the House	. 70
Whips of the House, duties of	81
White House, information concern-	00 010
ing 155-158, 20	
Wilson, President, plan to resign	
Women in Congress	28-61
PERSONAL EXPLANATION	

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning when the roll call was taken on the bill H. R. 3579, the second deficiency appropriation bill. I was unavoidably detained by a constituent in the office and did not arrive until after my name had been called. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION LAW

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to compliment the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules on the speed they have shown in reporting a very important and necessary bill at this time, the Presidential succession bill, making the Speaker of the House next in line for the Presidency should the present occupant of the White House die or become incapacitated.

As further proof of the need of revising this antiquated and uncertain line of succession, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that within 5 days, in this critical hour when the world looks to America, we will have had three different men as "heir apparent" to the Presidency.

Yesterday we had Mr. Stettinius. Today we have the Secretary of the Treasury. Perhaps by Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday we may have somebody else. Neither the country, nor we, know with any certainty who it will be.

If we are going to afford the necessary safety and security for this country in this critical hour, the mantle of power must fall on some certain office in this Government that has a more certain continuity. It should also fall upon an officer who holds his position of authority as a result of the greatest possible exercise of elected representatives expression of the voters of this country. Such an officer is the Speaker of the House.

I hope the Congress will pass this bill. The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Murphy] is recognized for 30 minutes.

HON. FRANK C. WALKER

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege for me to be allotted this time to address the members of this great body on the subject of the departure from the Federal service of one of the greatest Americans of our time, the honored, distinguished, beloved Postmaster General of the United States, Frank Comerford Walker.

While Frank Walker is being succeeded by an able, honest, industrious, energetic, in fact, a great American and a worthy successor who will bring laurels and credit to the Office of Postmaster General, and prove to be a worthy, able, faithful assistant to a great President, and while I have a warm regard and a kind affection for Bob Hannegan, I do feel that because General Walker is from my congressional district and is known and loved by everyone back home that I should take this occasion to make a review of his stewardship.

General Walker in many respects may be said to be a citizen of the Union, with close personal ties in New York State, with fond close personal ties in the State of Montana, and with warm devoted friendships as well as active business interests in the great State of Pennsylvania, and particularly in my congressional district, where the Postmaster General casts his ballot at the general

and municipal elections.

For the record I would like, Mr. Speaker, to insert at this point what Who's Who has to say of Frank Comerford Walker:

Frank Comerford Walker. Postmaster General; born Plymouth, Pennsylvania, May 30, 1886; son of David and Ellen (Comer-Walker; student Gonzaga University, 1903-06, LLD. 1937; LLB. University of Notre Dame, 1909, LLD. 1934; LLD. Montana School of Mines, Butte, 1934, George-town University, 1942, Manhattan College, 1943; married Hallie Boucher, November 11, 1914; children-Thomas Joseph, Laura Hallie. Admitted to Montana bar, 1909; lawyer; member of Walker and Walker; formerly president and general counsel Comerford Theaters, Inc., Meco Realty Co., Comerford Publix Corporation; director First Na-tional Bank of Scranton. Member of Mon-tana Legislature, 1913; assistant district at-torney Silver Bow County, Montana, 1909-12; became treasurer Democratic National Committee 1932 (resigned); executive sec-retary President's Executive Council, 1933; excutive director National Emergency Council to December 1935; Postmaster General United States since September 1940. Chairman Democratic National Committee January 1943-January 1944. Commissioned first lieutenant United States Army World War I. Trustee Notre Dame University; regent University of Scranton. Member American, Montana State, and New York State bar associations. Democrat. K. C. Home: Scranton, Pennsylvania. Address: Post Office Depart-ment, Washington, D. C.; and 1600 Broad-way, New York, N. Y.

In the city of Scranton, Pa., the name Frank Comerford Walker stands for everything that is good, clean, pure, and wholesome. It stands for the highest in moral, spiritual, ethical, economical, and political conduct. Frank Walker's middle name, Comerford, is a name loved, honored, and respected in our community.

M. E. Comerford, the uncle of Frank C. Walker, was a pioneer in the business sense in northeastern Pennsylvania. M. E. Comerford was born on May 10, 1868, in Minersville, Schuylkill County, Pa. He received his schooling in the local public schools and business college. In 1919 he commenced the organization of a chain of theaters which has grown to be one of the leading theater chains in northeastern United States. He was also associated with a number of other business enterprises. In this work he had the able assistance of the great M. B. Comerford, a nephew, who for many years had worked as an educator in Plymouth Township, Luzerne County, Pa. He applied the skill of the educator, the training and good judgment he had developed over the years to the business interests of his uncle and in many ways contributed toward making the several organizations initiated by M. E. Comerford great business enterprises.

In the course of time Frank C. Walker became closely identified and affiliated with these interests. He loved his uncle, M. E. Comerford, as we in Pennsylvania unanimously loved him.

It is, therefore, an honor for me to state to this distinguished body and through the Record and the press that the Nation's loss, insofar as national greatness and active service is concerned, is our gain in Scranton, Pa. To you, Mr. Postmaster General, we say a thousand welcomes. We are glad to have you with sufficient time so that we may see more of you in our home community.

A man tied by birth and upbringing to areas where people must work very hard and where great numbers receive few of the good things of life. He himself early attained success in the practice of the law and in private business. He has never forgotten those less fortunate than himself.

He is a workman and a very capable workman. He has a reputation of being able to work with anyone. He is co-operative, conciliatory, tolerant of others, quick to give a word of recognition for success, ready to take the blame himself when a common enterprise encounters difficulties.

He is truly a charitable man. He has a genuine respect for his fellows, wishes them well, and does what he can to help them. This charity, I think, flows from the fact that in a humble and quiet way he is a deeply religious man. He knows that the success which has come to him imposed new responsibilities upon him. Those of us who know him best rejoice that he meets those responsibilities, that in his private and public life he is a model of what an American gentleman should be.

He is a thoughtful man, concerned for his country's welfare. His public addresses are never of a flamboyant character, but they reveal a man who stands on the rock of principle. Time and again in those addresses he shows himself deeply concerned with the problem of the peace. "Men whose homes have been saddened by war must unite to banish war from the earth." And he has quoted with ringing effect the words of Pope Pius XII:

If ever a generation has had to appreciate from the depths of its conscience the call "war on war" it is the present generation.

And Mr. Walker declared:

The God who gave us talents has promised that He will hold us to an accounting of our talents. We have the capacity to achieve peace. We are summoned to labor for peace. We must heed the call.

Mr. Walker's administration of the postal service has been a most notable one. It is not too much to say that it will long be referred to as a golden era in the history of the postal establishment. The payment into the Treasury of large surpluses attracted attention but in these days military news naturally attracts the greatest attention. The people have not seen the complete picture of Mr. Walker's accomplishment.

Total surplus, over \$189,000,000.

Net surplus total is almost as much as the sum total of all surpluses ever paid into the Treasury by the Post Office Department.

The Walker regime has been a service regime. The postal establishment, under the most adverse conditions, was operated at high efficiency. That efficiency, however, was not won by being unjust to employees. Fair treatment and recognition of the men and women who make the postal service what it is was the keynote of Mr. Walker's policy.

America has many men who have great administrative skill. The country was fortunate, however, in having at the helm of this great enterprise during the war years, a man rarely gifted as an administrator who was also a thoughtful student of what should be the public policy of the Postal Service.

I am glad to announce that it was during the Walker regime that the postal workers received as a result of the action of Congress on yesterday the raise which they so richly deserve. A raise which was coming to them since 1925.

Frank Walker was a loyal, devoted, close personal friend of one of the greatest of Americans, the late beloved President Franklin D. Roosevelt. When President Roosevelt came to Washington to assume his duties as President of the United States, he was accompanied by Frank Walker, and some few weeks ago the Postmaster General had the sad experience of returning to Hyde Park to see laid at rest the mortal remains of that noble American. May I quote from a recent address of the Postmaster General on Decoration Day relative to President Roosevelt:

He had a simple faith in God, and where his beloved head really rests God's hand will smooth his pillow.

Throughout the early days of the Roosevelt administration, when the country—yes, the world—was on the brink of chaos, the President found a true, devoted, energetic, sincere, loyal friend at his side handling many of the intricate and involved problems of those days.

In July 1933 Mr. Walker became executive secretary of the Executive Council, sometimes known as the Super Cabinet. In those days the papers referred to Mr. Walker as the coordinator, the central point of contact with the Cabinet and the new recovery agencies. It was his duty to decide question of function, jurisdiction, duplication, and administration. Liberals thought of him as an enlightened conservative; conservatives thought of him as a sort of brakeman who would keep one eye on excesses, and almost everybody thought of him as Assistant President.

In December 1933 Mr. Walker was given an even more important coordinating position as head of the National Emergency Council. Said the London Evening Standard:

He will be more powerful than any Cabinet Minister. His real function will be that of Lord High Coordinator.

Codes needed to be coordinated, information furnished, consumers' councils set up all over the country, the Central Statistical Board created. To perform this task Mr. Walker commuted from New York to Washington for a stay of 3 or 4 days each week, devoting the rest of his time to his business interests. Shortly thereafter he left Government service.

In 1935 while he and Mrs. Walker were in Atlantic City in April, Mr. Walker was called to Washington unexpectedly again, this time to serve as head of the Division of Application and Information of the \$4,000,000,000 works relief program.

Mr. Walker was chairman of the committee that raised funds to establish the memorial library at President Roosevelt's Hyde Park estate which houses his personal papers.

After resigning in December 1935 as works relief chief to return to private life, Mr. Walker was later appointed by President Roosevelt to succeed Postmaster General James A. Farley. The announcement came as a surprise at the annual meeting of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Club at Hyde Park on August 31, 1940, although actually Mr. Walker had been mentioned for years as Mr. Farley's probable successor. Said President Roosevelt of his old friend:

He came from Montana and lived in New York and then, because of his interests, became a citizen of Pennsylvania, which is a pretty good record. In other words, he knows the country and is going to know a lot about the mails and communications of the country from now on.

When Mr. Walker was appointed the New York Times greeted his appointment with approval, finding him a "coolheaded pioneer" in the New Deal who nevertheless "has no share in the fads and fanaticisms of some of its acolytes."

According to Current Biography in 1940, Mr. Walker first encountered Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1920 when, as head of a local committee, he received the Democratic Vice Presidential candidate. In 1925 Mr. Walker came to New York City with his wife and two children to be general counsel and manager of Comerford Theatres, Inc., a chain of

movie houses in New York and Pennsylvania owned by his uncle. There Mr. Walker met Roosevelt once more and became a Roosevelt booster. One of the inner circle of friends and advisers even before the 1932 Democratic nominating convention, Mr. Walker was one of those who helped promote the Roosevelt boom. He helped to organize the Northwest for Roosevelt, and in 1932 served as treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. In 1943 he served as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. At the Chicago convention in July 1940. Mr. Walker was one of those who was largely responsible for the third term acceptance by our late President. Mr. Speaker, I speak from personal experience when I stated that at the Chicago convention in 1944 Mr. Walker was one of those largely responsible for the conduct of the convention, particularly as it applied not alone to the nomination of the late President for the fourth term but as it applied to the selection of the then Vice Presidential candidate, the distinguished and beloved President of today, Harry S. Truman.

Few men in our times have rendered such distinguished, unselfish, national service as Postmaster General Walker. Not once, but time after time, he deserted his private pursuits to answer appeals of the Chief Magistrate of the Nation to fill roles in national emergencies for which he was peculiarly fitted through character, personality, adaptability, and administrative experience. In each and every instance he measured up to the high confidence reposed in him by the Chief Executive.

Such outstanding service is only consonant with the man. His training, his philosophy, his business creed, his personal values are such as to honor the integrity of the individual, treat with his fellows fairly, deal honestly with the other party and the public. It was not by accident that Postmaster General Walker made a success of all the governmental tasks he undertook. He merely applied those basic rules of fairness and understanding to his public work that characterized his private life. He always pitted the real spiritual values against the purely material. He recognized the dignity and sovereignty of the human personality and accorded men equity and right.

It was because of all these things that Postmaster Walker was on such safe and sure ground when he entered the field of foreign affairs for any comment or suggestion. His was a mighty voice for good and right in the high councils of the Nation. He was an uncompromising foe of evil no matter what form of social, political or economic exploitation it took. At the outset he branded nazism for what it was, an ungodly totalitarian rule that degraded men and poisoned the fountain springs of humanity. He ever insisted that there could be no compromise with such a foe-that Hitlerism and all its works must be uprooted and destroyed forever. In like manner, he addressed himself forthrightly to the enemy in the Pacific. Mr. Walker knew that the things the Axis stood for must be blotted out of our contemporary world if there was ever to be any hope for the establishment of a peaceful, equitable order of security in the future. It was no wonder that the late Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, valued Mr. Walker's counsel almost beyond that of any other living individual.

In a similar way, President Truman sets a high value of Mr. Walker's views and experience. It was only after the most urgent persuasion that President Truman consented that Mr. Walker withdraw to public life, and then only with the understanding that he would be always available for consultation and emergency drafting. Frank Walker, friend, counsellor and confident of President Roosevelt, an early booster and ardent advocate of President Truman for the second place on the 1944 Democratic ticket, today stands as the medium through which the Truman administration can best give effective continuity to the Rooseveltion policies. I know that Mr. Walker's official departure will not mean the end of his influence in Washington.

It would be unfortunate if it did, for Frank Walker had represented one of the most wholesome influences in our national life and in our National Capital in the past dozen years. In these trying times, when the call is for qualified leadership, it would be regrettable if this profound influence for good were to be lost to our Government and, in turn, to the world.

Frank Walker knew Big Business and Wall Street, and yet he knew how the average man feels about them and was more inclined to share that opinion. Mr. Walker is a man of the Tom Walsh—"Teapot Dome" Walsh—type, tenacious, patient, and scrupulously honest. While he may be seen cheering at prizefights and football games, he is as phlegmatic as a Joffre or a Marshall in the face of trouble. His mode of conduct in public life seems to have been that the best slogan is "No publicity is good publicity."

Yet, I feel it would be a disservice to the Nation, a disservice to the Postmaster General, a disservice to Mrs. Walker and the Walker family, and a disservice to the young men and women of the coming generation if I were not to outline today for the Record an appraisal of a great and noble American.

A quiet, diffident, unassuming, and yet courageous, strong, energetic character is about to depart from the public service; Mr. Speaker, I hope not for long.

Mr. Speaker, in the days ahead, in the period of the victory yet to be a final one, in the period of reconversion with its vast, intricate, difficult, heartbreaking problems, it is good that our great President has men of the type of Frank Walker, who upon the call of the President will leave their desks, their busy desks and daily assignments, to journey back to Washington to help relieve the burdens of the busy day, to help to rest the head, the mind, the soul, and the spirit at eventide.

Few men have been privileged to retire from public life, after a dozen or more years in the national spotlight, with such an unblemished record as our distinguished citizen from Scranton, Pa. He has set a high standard for public conduct. He has been an inspiration to all who have had the privilege of working with him. By his daily zeal, devotion to his tasks, and unflinching loyalty to what we may best describe as the ideals of true good government, he has not only advanced the common weal but has strengthened and fortified the structure of democracy. His public work stands out as a bulwark of patriotic service and devotion. I know I bespeak the sentiments of this House, this Congress, his fellow Americans, when I say well done, General Walker; God grant you good health, long life, and the rich rewards to which your unselfish service to your fellows and your country entitles you.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's statement is absolutely correct. I know that based upon knowledge and experience and I also know that the late President had a very high regard for Postmaster General Walker. On a number of occasions when I had conferences with the President, he expressed the high regard that he had for Frank Walker and the complete confidence that he had in him. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] pay this very fine tribute to not only a great public official and a great American, but a fine fellow personally. Frank Walker is one of the finest men I have ever met. He is possessed of a nobility of character and an inspiration to everyone, setting an example for all to follow.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I have listened with great interest to the splendid eulogy that he has delivered to Frank Walker relating to the services which he has rendered and will render to his country.

I became acquainted with Frank Walker as a member of the Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and I eulogized him upon two separate occasions on the floor of this House for the magnificent management which he put into the postal service.

May I also say to the gentleman that I have a rather personal reason for my interest in the statement that the gentleman has made because his uncle, Mr. Mike Comerford, to whom the gentleman has referred, and who for so many years owned and operated Comerford Theatrical Enterprises in Pennsylvania and New York, was one of the most intimate friends of a late deceased brother of mine who was associated with Mr. Mike Comerford in those enterprises. Upon the death of Mr. Comerford and the accession of Frank Walker to the management of those enterprises my brother was interested with him for a period of some 20 years. He has told me repeatedly that no man of greater moral character ever lived than Frank Walker. I think it is entirely proper that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has seen fit to place this very fine tribute to a great American in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentle-

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. I cannot let this occasion pass without saying that I endorse fully everything that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Keefe], have said about our distinguished friend, Frank Walker. He has been a great public servant. He is a great patriot. He is a noble man, and God never made a better man than Frank Walker.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want to compliment the gentleman on the fine address he is making in behalf of our mutual friend, the Postmaster General, Frank C. Walker. While you speak for him from Pennsylvania, I would like to speak for him from Montana, because Frank, after he left school, came out West to Butte, made a name for himself in Silver Bow County, and we of the State of Montana still look upon Frank as one of our own, and we know that Frank still looks with a good deal of consideration and kindness upon us. We hate to see Frank leave the Postmaster

We know also that he has made a splendid record as Postmaster General, and we want to join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, with the people of Pennsylvania, and for that matter with the people of the United States in wishing our present Postmaster General all the happiness it is possible for him to achieve in this world.

Generalship, but we know that he has

other duties which are calling him.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I would like to say that I am delighted to hear my neighbor, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Murphy] from the county of Lackawanna, which is in the district adjoining mine, the county of Luzerne, say these very fine things in tribute to one of Pennsylvania's leading citizens.

I am glad to hear our distinguished Speaker, the majority leader, the gentleman from Montana, and the gentleman from Wisconsin add their splendid words of tribute.

During the course of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Murphy] he referred to the Comerford family and to the fine and distinguished Walker family. In my district, where the Postmaster General was born in the little borough of Plymouth, there with his parents and relatives he first became the beloved figure which has endeared him to all of us Americans. The

homestead still stands there. The Comerford family and the Walker relatives are there today. I am sure their hearts will be warmed by these words spoken in the great House of Representatives. Certainly America is proud to know, and the people of my district in Luzerne, and of your district, sir, of Lackawanna, are glad to know that we have been so close for so many years to America's great citizen, Postmaster General Walker. I hope that his services to our country and to the people of the world will continue for many, many years.

Mr. MURPHY. I want to thank my

Mr. MURPHY. I want to thank my friend and neighbor from Pennsylvania for his splendid remarks. I yield to the distinguished lady from California [Mrs. Douglas].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I am very happy for this opportunity to express the sentiment of the State of California. California loves Frank Walker. The people of California placed their trust in Frank Walker and he never failed them. He is a good, honorable gentleman.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the distinguished lady from California.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. WEISS. We from western Pennsylvania wish to join in the splendid tribute given to Postmaster General Walker, a great public official, a man of great moral character, a fine citizen, and an outstanding American.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CHINA-INDIA-BURMA THEATER

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am rising today to speak upon the recent operations in the China-India-Burma theater, where the eyes of America have now turned to examine what kind of a job has been done in preparation for the gigantic task which lies ahead of us.

As a serviceman who has recently returned from service on a Navy carrier in the Pacific to take his seat in Congress, I feel that there should be outlined the aspects of the tremendous problems in the Pacific which have faced our Army Service Forces while the spotlight was turned on the European theater during the magnificent campaign led by General Eisenhower.

Because of the great distances, the varied climates and characters of the countries, the problems in the Orient are so much different from the European theater and are of so great a diversity, that we should pause to let the American

people know the fine accomplishments and devotion to duty which have been so far demonstrated in this theater of the war.

Supplies of all kinds have been poured into the China-India-Burma theater under the direction of the Service Forces of our Army.

The three principal jobs with which the command of our Army Service Forces were entrusted were: First, the operation of the ports in India so that today all American ships coming into Indian ports are unloaded under American supervision. The second of these jobs was the operation of the railway lines in India and China, which are vital links in the Allied communications. The third job was the building of roads and pipe lines from China to India, so that now we have the Ledo Road, officially called the Stilwell Highway, and also the longest pipe line in the world, which is now in operation from Calcutta to China.

All of these immense jobs were necessary to be completed in order to bring our strength against the Japanese, and to keep China in the war in the early phase, as well as to fulfill the purpose of amassing the huge amounts of supplies and stores to service the present phase upon which we are now entering.

It should be pointed out that the American Services of Supply have conducted many varied operations closely coordinated under a single command. These operations included the actual supply operation, requisitioning, as well as the shipping and handling of supplies.

The work does not end there. The Services of Supply are responsible for construction, transportation, communication. They build airfields and they build roads. They assemble and maintain motor vehicles. They operate ports. They run railroads. They are responsible for the many administrative matters in connection with the discipline of troops and also have charge of the Chaplain Corps.

With this amazing diversity of duties, it is a pleasure to comment today upon the smoothness of operation and the success which the Services of Supply of the American Army have achieved up to this date in the China-India-Burma theater.

The efficiency of operation has been so high that the American public has pretty much taken it for granted that our troops in the China-India-Burma theater will naturally be supplied with all the equipment that is necessary to carry on the campaigns on the widespread fronts now in operation against the Japs. The absence of any friction in this theater and the absence of delays, which would have cost months of extended warfare and hundreds of thousands of lives, are especially to be noted.

It has been said of the operation that the secret of its success was the building of men into teams and the guiding of successful and efficient teams rather than the handling of individual men. This policy developed in teams the sense of responsibility and accomplishment, and gave the good old American virtues of initiative and speed their full opportunity for development.

The morale problem in this theater has been one of the greatest problems which had to be faced. And the problems which had to be faced were certainly unique in history as far as America is concerned. Maj. Melvyn Douglas, husband of the gentlewoman Member of Congress from California, played a large part in building up and maintaining the splendid morale now obtaining in this theater.

We have all heard of the building of the Stilwell Highway from China to India, and have heard of the mountain ranges through which construction had to be made, to get the vital supplies to China from India. We have heard of the flying of the supplies across the "Hump" so that China would be kept in the war.

The pipe line that I have spoken of previously, which now carries gasoline for China and services the Fourteenth Air Force bases in India, is especially to be commented upon as one of the outstanding engineering accomplishments of our generation. To cite one example of the difficulty of the work, the pipe line was laid for 1,200 miles through winding gorges, swamps, and marshes, and climbs over the rocky crags of the Eastern Himalavas.

One section in Burma where the Ledo Road crosses mountain ranges at an elevation over 5,000 feet, the road was so crooked and twisting that it was impossible to parallel it with the pipe line. The engineers decided to put the pipe line over the mountains by the shortest possible route. The access road and pipe line were laid directly across the mountainous terrain regardless of the difficulties which were encountered. There was some question whether the project would not have to be abandoned because it seemed impossible to be done—but the Americans did it.

It is peculiarly appropriate at this time to stop to comment upon the officer in charge of this command, as I am advised that at a ceremony in the Pentagon Building on Tuesday, 26 June last, Gen. Brehon Somervell, Chief of all Army Service Forces, decorated with his second Distinguished Service Medal of this war that officer, Maj. Gen. W. E. R. Covell.

General Covell has had the responsibility of operating the most extensive and difficult land supply lines in this global war and certainly deserves the thanks of a grateful country as evidenced by the decoration by General Somervell on Tuesday. Far-flung projects have progressed smoothly and ahead of schedule under his watchful eye. America welcomes General Covell and his staff on their return from India, and a grateful country echoes with General Somervell a sincere well done.

Because of my interest in attempting to explain the method of operations that has produced such results, I have checked to find what the China India Burma Theater newspaper has said about the Services Organization. Under an article entitled, "Find It—Furnish It—Fix It Covell's SOS Creed," it states:

The port installations under Covell's command moved more cargo faster than any other United States Army port installations in the world. • • • General Covell is one

of the shrewdest coordinators in the Army. He is a product of both West Point and big business, and he has brought a combination of the best features of the military and industry to the number one supply job in the China-India-Burma Theater. He hates red tape, and more than once has shown an impatience with procrastination, official or otherwise.

It is interesting to note that General Covell was graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point with a bachelor of science degree in 1915, standing No. 1 in his class. He was graduated in the now famous class of 1915 which includes such outstanding men as General Eisenhower, General Bradley, and General McNarney.

General Covell first came to military notice in World War I when he served as assistant to colonel, now General George C. Marshall in the operations section of the First Army headquarters in France.

The general is known to the District of Columbia, for 4 years having been assistant engineer commissioner of the District, having written and put into effect the Washington plan for public utilities.

In closing, permit me to quote from one of the general's own statements which I have read recently, where he states in essence the spirit which typifies our troops in the China-India-Burma theater:

Our service of supply troops in this part of the world have caught the true Army Service Forces spirit. Their job is to help other troops, not just to take care of themselves. Many of them are out in the jungle, but even there they have maintained this fine spirit of service. We feel we are doing a good job. Our motto is: "Find it—furnish it—fix it," and all our efforts are directed toward carrying this out.

In looking ahead to the tremendous tasks which we now face in the second phase of the operations to crush Japan as a military power, the supply operations which have now reached such amazing proportions in the China-India-Burma theater can be said to have laid the firm and deep foundations of the Army's expected successes.

We in Congress, whether from the Army or the Navy, therefore today salute the fine Army Service of Supply Forces wherever they are, working in teeming jungle or flying over rocky crags.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to join the gentleman in paying a fine and deserving tribute and compliment to General Covell for the splendid and outstanding service he has performed in the Army Service Forces.

Mr. FULTON. I believe the gentleman is the general's home town Congressman, is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. May I observe that General Covell came to Arkansas several years ago as manager of the Crossett lumber industries, which is one of the most outstanding businesses of its kind in the United States, and I may say in the world. He came to Crossett as manager of that great industry and inaugurated a program of better cooperation

between labor and management. The type of leadership that he gave to the people there is an example of the fine service he has performed in this war. Though he was not in Arkansas long before he was called into the service, he became endeared to the hearts of the people of our State and we all have the highest esteem for him. We know that when he was called into the service he was a colonel, and the progress that he has made in these few years in this war demonstrates the type of leadership that General Covell possesses.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the remarks he made concerning the service forces in the CBI area. I feel that that part of the world has been forgotten by too many Americans and for too long a time. Now, with the combat troops, both air and ground, out of India and Burma, we have only the service troops left to keep the port of Calcutta open, to keep the railroads open, to keep the barge lines open, to keep the pipe lines open, and the roads, and also to keep the traffic over the Hump moving. I am delighted that these people who are at the end of the line in more ways than one are getting this recognition in the House today.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California, Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. First of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his mention of my husband, Major Douglas, and for the very nice things he said about him. I wish also to commend the gentleman for bringing to the attention of this House the India-Burma-China theater, a theater about which we know too little, I think.

I agree with the gentleman, that from all we have heard, the foundations have been well laid in this theater for the last half of the war and that will probably mean the speeding up of the war. From what I know of that theater they have been working under an unbelievable handicap there. First of all, there is the climate, a kind of heat that our people here are not prepared to meet. When you take a boy out of Brooklyn and another boy out of Pennsylvania and you drop them into the middle of India, you have a morale job to do. There is the fact that the people are strange, the boys do not know their language, and there is not an intimate contact that they may have immediately with them. Mail takes a long time to arrive at that field far away. All of these things make the morale job difficult. Added to that, there is no entertainment of any kind except a few movie shows and a very few theaters.

I thank the gentleman for bringing the attention of the House to this theater.

Mr. WEISS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WEISS. I knew General Covell as Colonel Covell. When he was head of the Army engineers in the Pittsburgh district, I sponsored flood-control legislation in the House of Representatives to prevent recurrence of those devastating floods in the Pittsburgh area.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman was then Senator Weiss; is that correct?

Mr. WEISS. Yes. I had been working in close conjunction with Colonel Covell, and it was his engineering genius and pattern of the dams and locks throughout the entire northern Pennsylvania area that prevented the recurrence of floods in recent years. He deserves great credit, and I commend the gentleman for his tribute to Colonel Covell.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentle-

man from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TIBBOTT. I desire to join with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton], in his very fine commendation of Major General Covell. It has been my privilege to know General Covell for a number of years. During the time in which he was district engineer for western Pennsylvania, the United States Army engineers, under his efficient leadership, built the largest channelization project for flood control in the country at Johnstown, Pa. The completion of this channel has brought great happiness to the people of this vicinity. The city is now known as flood-free Johnstown. General Covell has many, many friends in Johnstown, and they join with me in expressing our gratitude to him.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman

from Pennsylvania.
Mr. CORBETT. I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for very splendid tribute to General Covell and to tell him that I know the people of Pittsburgh join in this recognition of the very fine work he did to prevent destruction and suffering and loss of life in our area. It is certainly a fitting tribute to an able man.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] on the Central Valley project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. Powell (at the request of Mr. MARCANTONIO), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for 10 days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported

that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3035. An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service: to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 937. An act to amend an act suspending until June 30, 1945, the running of the statute of limitations applicable to violations of the antitrust laws, so as to continue such suspension until June 30, 1946.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to: accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 29, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in open session, on Friday, June 29, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the committee room 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be a meeting of Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary beginning at 10 a.m., on Monday, July 2, 1945, to continue hearings on the bill, H. R. 2788, to amend title 28 of the Judicial Code in regard to the limitation of certain actions, and for other purposes. The hearing will be held in room 346. House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

590. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the free importation of certain substances by the board of trustees of the United States Pharmacopoeial Convention and the council of the American Pharmaceutical Association, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1634. A bill for the relief of the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa; with amendment (Rept. No. 830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3603. A bill to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. 831). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1992. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of Alaska, in trust for the Roman Catholic Church; with amendment (Rept. No. 832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

CHENOWETH: Committee on . the Public Lands. S. 100. An act to authorize an exchange of certain lands with William W. Kiskadden in connection with the Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 911. An act authorizthe conveyance of certain lands to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 306. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3587, a bill to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President; without amendment (Rept. No. 835). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 3611. A bill to authorize the condemnation of materials which are intended for use in process or renovated butter and which are unfit for human consumption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3612. A till to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 3613. A bill to provide pension for cooperative observers of the Weather Bureau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARRINGTON: A. R. 3614. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 33 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1945, ex-tending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LEA: H. R. 3615. A bill to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air navigation facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3616. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Com-

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 225. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 305. Resolution to provide for fur-

ther expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 138, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California: H. R. 3617. A bill for the relief of San Jose Manufacturers, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims

By Mr. CURTIS: H. R. 3618. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vannas H. Hicks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 3619. A bill for the relief of Harry D. Koons; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3620. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Fry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3621. A bill for the relief of the J. M. Jones Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 3622. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hazel M. Skaggs; to the Committee on Claims. H. R. 3623. A bill for the relief of William A. Pixley; to the Committee on Claims. By Mr. ROGERS of New York:

H. R. 3624. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Apostolos Vasili Percas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1022. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of C. E. Hildebrand and 325 other citizens of Missouri, protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1023. Also, petition of Spencer Salisbury and 297 other citizens of Missouri, protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the

Committee on the Judiciary.

1024. By Mr. GEELAN: Petition submitted by Thomas J. Reardon of Hartford, Conn., urging the enactment of legislation concerning the extension and maintenance of credit for the purchase and carrying of securities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1025. Also, petition of Thomas J. Reardon, of Hartford, Conn., urging the enactment of legislation to prohibit the United States from joining with other nations of the world for the purpose of political and economic cooperation unless and until the proposition is submitted to the citizens of the United States for a vote thereon and that affirmative action must be by a two-thirds vote by the voters of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1026. Also, resolution submitted by Lawrence P. Spellacy, secretary of Meriden Aerie, No. 720, F. O. E., Meriden, Conn., June 26, 1945, memorializing Congress to designate the birthday of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt as a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1027. Also, resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut on June 6, 1945, submitted by Charles J. Prestia, secretary of state, memorializing Congress in favor of the passage of the Bretton Woods bill with the stabilization included; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1028. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Albert S. Conrad and sundry other residents of the Eighth Massachusetts Congressional District, favoring the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1029. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Resolution of eastern Washington public utility district, urging Congress to authorize con-struction of Foster Creek Dam and hydroelectric plant on the Columbia River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1030. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Petition signed by approximately 67 owners of automobile repair shops in Sussex County, N. J., protesting RMPR 165, OPA regulations, and recommending that RMPR 165, amendment No. 49, be abolished for the reasons outlined in the petition; to the Committee on Banking and Currency. 1031. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Hudson County Republican Com-

petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to calling public attention to various laws enacted in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1032. Also, petition of Vergil D. McMillan, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 29, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, June 25, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, from whom all holy desires, all good counsels and all just works do proceed, as the torch of a new day lights afresh the path of duty, we bow before Thee in humility and hope. We thank Thee for public servants who, in the darkened valleys of these tragic times, have failed not to lift unto the hills of help the eyes of this stricken generation. messengers of good will who from mountaintops of vision are now heralding a dawning day.

So guide by Thy wisdom the deliberations of this body, entrusted with vast power that awes and solemnizes our hearts, that here, in the fires of a great passion for healing peace, the sacrifices for freedom may be sanctified. Dedicate us anew to the yet unfinished task that we may win the peace for which brave men have died: And Thine shall be the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 28, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 511. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 3238. An act readjusting the rates of postage on catalogs and similar printed advertising and other matter of fourth-class mail, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3579. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years

ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 215. Joint resolution authorizing the production of petroleum for the national defense from Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) to transfer to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the functions, powers, duties, and records of certain corporations, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE FINAL SESSION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I intended yesterday to ask that the address delivered by the President at San Francisco on Tuesday be printed in the body of the Congressional Record. Other things intervened, and the request was not made. I now make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the address delivered by the President will be printed in the

RECORD.

The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and delegates to the United Nations Conference on International Organization, oh, what a great day this can be in history.

I deeply regret that the press of circumstances when this Conference opened made it impossible for me to be here to greet you in person. I have asked for the privilege of coming today to express on behalf of the people of the United States our thanks for what you have done here and to wish you Godspeed on your journeys home.

Somewhere in this broad country, every one of you can find some of our citizens who are sons and daughters, or descendants in some degree, of your own native land. All our peoare glad and proud that this historic meeting and its accomplishments have taken place in our country. And that includes the millions of loyal and patriotic Americans who stem from the countries not represented at this Conference.

We are grateful for your coming. We hope you have enjoyed your stay and that you will come again.

You assembled in San Francisco almost 9 weeks ago with the high hope and confidence of peace-loving people the world over.

Their confidence in you has been justified.

Their hopes for your success have been fulfilled.

CALLS CHARTER A VICTORY

The Charter of the United Nations which you are now signing is a solid structure upon which we can build for a better world. tory will honor you for it. Between the victory in Europe and the final victory in Japan, in this most destructive of all wars, you have won a victory against war itself.

It was the hope of such a charter that helped sustain the courage of stricken peoples through the darkest days of the war. For it is a declaration of great faith by the nations of the earth-faith that war is not inevitable, faith that peace can be maintained

If we had had this charter a few years ago—and, above all, the will to use it—millions now dead would be alive. If we should falter in the future in our will to use it, millions now living will surely die.

It has already been said by many that this is only a first step to a lasting peace. That is true. The important thing is that all our